

THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1934.

THE PLIGHT OF GERMANY.

IN a lecture at Warsaw a few months ago the German Minister of Propaganda, Dr. Goebbels, defined the relationship between dictatorship and democracy as follows : " People and Government are one in Germany. The will of the people is the will of the Government and vice versa. The structure of the modern State in Germany is a kind of ennobled democracy in which there is authoritarian rule by virtue of a mandate from the people." While the last plebiscite was being prepared, leading persons in the Third Realm expressed themselves similarly, and Hitler himself went so far as to say that Germany was the most democratic land in the world because he caused the plenitude of his usurped power to be confirmed by a vote. The truth is that the leaders of the Third Realm pay their respects to democratic principle from time to time merely to make a favourable impression abroad. In this way they endeavour to conceal the fact that they achieved power in an implacable struggle against democratic forms and principles.

How great is their hypocrisy may be seen in the circumstance that the new science of government in Germany does not hesitate to characterise the referendum as a farce. In the *Grundriss der allgemeinen Staatslehre*, by Professor Kollreuther of Munich University, who is also " Councillor of State " (*Staatsrat*) and member of the Academy of German Law, the following passage occurs : " In the national constitutional State (*Rechtsstaat*) "—a curious term incidentally for the Hitlerite despotism—" there is no room for the forms of political democracy. This is particularly true with regard to direct democracy. . . . The principle of creating majorities by the ballot is altogether foreign to the nature of the *Führerstaat*" (a State based on the principle of leadership), " especially when the ballot takes the form of a referendum. Referenda only come into question as a particularly ceremonial declaration of assent to the political actions of the leaders." Here is the whole thing in a nutshell. A referendum can only be used as long as the certainty prevails that the

result will be in accordance with the intentions of the *Führer*. It must involve no risk for him. Every possibility of danger must be eliminated. To the people is assigned the part of the chorus in a Greek tragedy: all they have to do is to accompany the words and deeds of the hero with words of laudatory recognition. "Ennobled democracy" is therefore a pure deception.

It would be a deception even if the plebiscite itself and the registration of the returns were surrounded by all the guarantees of law and equity. It is not enough if the citizen is able to decide freely with regard to his Aye or No at the moment when he fills in his ballot-paper and throws it into the ballot-box. He must be able to form an opinion as to the probable consequences of his decision in advance. This he cannot do where the right of assembly and combination and the freedom of the Press do not exist, where the task of enlightening and instructing the masses is reserved exclusively for the Government and its organs, and where all public criticism is followed by inhuman penalties as an act of treasonable hostility to the Government. The referendum is thereby debased to a kind of military parade. A mockery is made of democratic principles under the pretence of showing them every respect. But this mockery becomes all the worse when those who are in power do not shrink from falsifying the returns. That this was done on August 19th to a large extent and in many places is beyond a doubt. The falsifications carried out by subordinate officials who wished to demonstrate how favourably disposed their own regions were to the Government (falsifications for which they were duly thanked) have surpassed all the manœuvres which, until now, aroused the derision of the western European peoples for certain countries in the Balkans or in South America. If we take into account the number of those timorous people who—not unreasonably—feared that all kinds of harm would come upon them and their families should their opposition attitude be known, the repulsive picture is completed, the picture of a plebiscite which has formally conferred upon Hitler a power such as is held by no ruler of any community that can claim to be a civilised State.

Both the open and the secret opposition are indubitably much greater than is revealed by the official figures. Furthermore, it is a grotesque piece of misrepresentation when the

governing clique proclaims the necessity of converting the minority which, so far, has not been won over to the ideas symbolised by the Swastika. The governing clique behaves as though the Noes represented no more than a residue of the population which had hitherto failed to appreciate the Hitlerian gospel. The truth is that these Noes reveal the beginning of a new resistance. They are a manifestation of the millions who are turning away from National Socialism precisely because they have experienced it and have recognised its character. The great question of the future is : Does the dictatorship possess the means to lead these dissentients back to the True Faith, or will the courage they have shown exercise a power of attraction over those multitudes who still waver and hesitate ? One thing is certain : Hitler will never allow a referendum that could leave him in a minority. And whatever his policy may be, every caution will be taken to prevent dissatisfaction from expressing itself in figures more unfavourable to dictatorship than those of August 19th. But even if, contrary to all expectation, such a thing were to happen, a dictatorship that only goes to the country as long as it can mould the popular will according to its own desires would not be eliminated. We must guard ourselves against the illusion that Hitlerism can be overthrown by a plebiscite or an election. Its overthrow can only come about in two ways : either the system will collapse by its own incapacity to solve the problems which confront it or, being itself based on force, it will be overthrown by force.

It would be strange indeed if Hitler had not recognised these dangers and if he were not to do everything to circumvent them. But it is doubtful whether this ambitious man, with his lack of self-restraint and self-knowledge, clearly recognises what a burden he has placed on his own shoulders. He has put a crown upon his head that would be too heavy for a man stronger than himself and for one who could wear it with greater dignity. It is hardly to be expected of him (when all his characteristics are considered) that he will be abashed by the divine attributes with which he is credited ; but it will soon be evident that he has overstepped the limits set for mortal men, and perhaps he will yearn for the time when he shared the formal responsibility with a President, behind whose broad back he could hide himself whenever he would not or could not keep the promises made during his

rise. Demands and accusations will be addressed to him personally, and the excuse that there are forces within his Government which thwart the execution of his good intentions will no longer make an impression. Moreover, the myth with which National Socialism invested both itself and its leader has begun to dwindle since June 30th. The stark reality is coming to its own. The intoxication of the first period is vanishing, and, having reverted to their everyday mood, people are no longer satisfied with propaganda, but wish to see results. The results that must be achieved can no longer fit in with the National Socialist programme. Amongst the obstacles that stand in their way are those that have been created by the policy of the Third Realm. Germany's situation is truly desperate. She is politically, economically and morally isolated. Her credit has been ruined in every respect. The material means and the confidence are lacking, both of them absolutely necessary for a State that is not willing to sink into poverty and barbarism. Will Hitler, with such a plenitude of power at his disposal, be able to save Germany?

Surely not, if he continues in the same path. The present "Leader of the Reich," as he is now termed, endeavours to remove all the blame from himself and from his policy and to transfer it to the outside world, just as he did when he was Chancellor. And those who speak and act in his name and on his behalf follow his example. Germany, so they argue, is in difficulties only because the other Powers are obtuse and malevolent. She looks round upon a hostile world that will not recognise her peaceful intentions, and is always refusing the friendly hand she is holding out. This theme is repeated day in, day out, always in the same manner. All Hitler's speeches are fundamentally the same. All actions that have aroused and promoted the distrust of the outside world are passed over in silence. Just as little is said about a rearmament that contravenes international treaties, about the brusque exodus from the League of Nations, about the intrigues directed against the independence of Austria, as is said about the education of a whole people in the spirit of militarism and about the cruel persecution of all real supporters of a pacifist ideal. In these circumstances, every declaration that the Third Realm wishes to live on friendly terms with all, and especially with France, loses its validity and appears to the outside world as a tactical manœuvre. The outside world is at least compelled to ask whether such

declarations are worth anything for more than a moment, and cannot fail to register the fact that, at a time when warlike complications threaten in the East rather than in the West, these gestures that seem to promise and to desire nothing but peace are directed exclusively towards the West.

To break this ring of distrust Hitler would have to give German foreign policy an entirely new direction. He would have to bring his country back into the comity of nations, dispel every suspicion of aggressive expansionist policy, give guarantees of non-intervention in Austrian affairs, and above all refrain from determining the extent of his armaments according to his own arbitrary will. The great question is this—is he not only willing but, in consideration of his fellow Nazis and of the Reichswehr, is he able? He would be compelled to destroy many conceptions called forth by himself and to abjure doctrines laid down in his book, *Mein Kampf*. This will not be easy, for even an absolute Dictator is a prisoner of his propaganda and of those with whose help he was victorious. It is a mistake to suppose that it is easier to change political direction in a despotism than in a democracy. A dictatorship is condemned to consistency more than any other form of government. Nevertheless, it is not inconceivable that a skilful education could make a reversal in the course of his foreign policy acceptable to the masses. For many have confidence in the *Führer*, in accordance with Dr. Goebbels' admonitions, even when they do not understand him, or because they do not understand him, and because, despite all military display, the desire for military adventures is small, at least amongst the older generation. But there is a sphere in which all the arts of propaganda are bound to fail in the end, namely the sphere of economics, in which it is the realities that speak and cannot be drowned by any verbal agitation, however impressive.

It is sufficiently remarkable that, as far as the economic system is concerned, Hitler has conferred his dictatorial powers first upon Herr Schmidt and now, after the alleged illness of the latter, upon Dr. Schacht. Is it recognition of his own ignorance, is it the lack of interest in subjects that do not readily fit into the scheme of his public speeches, or is it the hope of being able to make others seem responsible in case of a fiasco, that has led the *Führer* to limit his own competence in this matter? Whatever the reason, in the end he himself will be held accountable for the deeds and the omissions of

his subordinates. It is, after all, in accordance with Hitler's own policy if Dr. Schacht places the responsibility for all economic and social distress and difficulty on the outside world and on previous German Governments, while denying the mistakes—they might even be called crimes—committed in the name of National Socialist policy. It must, of course, be admitted that the complete failure of all attempts to achieve a reasonable international co-operation in economic matters has helped to make the German situation more desperate; but the President of the Reichsbank is grossly misleading when he tries to create the impression that the severe economic crisis in which Germany now finds herself is not principally due to the measures approved and promoted by himself against his own better knowledge.

Let us summarise. Unrestricted rearmament has swallowed huge sums. To carry out this rearmament the import of raw materials needed had to be increased, so that the trade balance and the balance of payments were over-burdened, seeing that the manufactured goods remain in the country. The Government has endeavoured to justify this expenditure not only by the necessity of warding off hostile attacks but also by considerations of a social nature. How dubious it is to combat unemployment by artificially stimulating the armament industry hardly requires emphasis. But even if the desired aim is momentarily achieved to a certain extent, the means for creating this or similar unproductive work as well as for the maintenance of the brown-shirted militia were made available by discounting bills and by burdening the budgets of future years in advance. In addition, agriculture and industrial concerns received big subsidies. In this way the public finances have been ruined and the gold held by the Reichsbank has been almost used up. The result is an increase in the floating debt to almost 8,000 million marks and a decrease in the gold reserve to 75 million marks. The situation of the working class, taken as a whole, has not grown better but worse. A small percentage enjoy higher wages, but the total wage bill has decreased even where employment has increased, while the prices of the most necessary foodstuffs are steadily rising. Nor is unemployment removed when hundreds of thousands are sent compulsorily to labour camps which largely serve a purpose of military training.

The shrinking exports which accompany these phenomena might perhaps be attributed to causes that are not determined

by German policy alone. The world crisis, the tendency shown in all States to shut themselves up, the devaluation of the pound and the dollar, have narrowed the foreign markets for German goods. But it must not be forgotten that Germany has herself contributed much to her own blockade. The proclamation of self-sufficiency was one of the essential points in the Hitlerite agitation. The barbaric methods of the Government, the persecutions and expropriation of the Jews, have led to an open or secret boycott of German products. Perpetual declarations of hostility to Bolshevism have led Russia to place orders in countries other than Germany. Duties on agricultural products and compulsory cartels have raised the cost of German industrial production, so that no one can honestly assert that the passivity of the trade balance, which reached 258 millions in the first seven months of 1934, while German foreign trade in the corresponding period in 1933 still had a favourable balance of 316 millions, could be principally attributed to the ill-will of the rest of the world.

How will the Dictatorship get rid of the chains which it has forged for itself? It has begun by strangling imports and, with them, production and employment. But this method would only promise success if it were accompanied by a radical breach with the system followed hitherto, that is to say, if the Government had the courage to put the budgets of the State and the public corporations in order, and to recover at least some confidence abroad by forgoing its wild rearmament programme and by ceasing to finance "productive work" for the unemployed—in other words, by returning to healthy and rational economic principles. But the Government knows that this way is full of danger—it would mean a departure from its ideology and, even worse, an increase in the already considerable social tension, seeing that the working class and the middle class would be deceived in all their hopes. Thus the Government proclaims through the mouth of Dr. Schacht the continuation of its present policy, come what may. Germany is to be barricaded against the world, to be entirely self-sufficient, and to make up for the lack of raw materials by the production of artificial substitutes, until foreign trade would then assume the character of medieval barter. But we should do Dr. Schacht an injustice if we were to assume that he himself believes that such a plan could be carried out. His purpose is to bluff foreign creditors and those who are interested in selling their products to

Germany. While threatening them with the complete self-sufficiency of the Reich and with the cessation not only of political but also of private debt-payments, he believes that he can make other countries more willing to make concessions. He believes that, so as not to lose everything, they will be willing to agree to the several years' moratorium which has been demanded and to the reduction of the interest payable later on, besides granting new industrial credits at once.

Even if this speculation were correct, the difficulties confronting the régime would only be removed for the time being. But is it correct? Will those who are in a position to help Hitlerism allow themselves to be blackmailed by Hitlerism? It is hardly conceivable that they will risk everything in the very insecure expectation of a small advantage. It is still less conceivable that they will give a Government, which imperfectly conceals its preparations for war behind peaceful speeches, the possibility to obtain the raw materials it needs for armaments. This is the point which may be decisive for the future of the Dictatorship. Trade and industry cannot be saved by the National Socialist recipe which Dr. Schacht has adopted. But a system that intolerably tightens the belt and delivers the German people over to extreme distress cannot last. The forces of the Opposition which were stirring even before June 30th and then again on August 19th will increase and rally. The determination of this Opposition will not be expressed in a referendum, but in a very different manner, and it will not again be stifled in blood. To make any prophecies with regard to the period and the phases of this development would be idle and dangerous. It would be quite mistaken to hope that the Dictatorship will be overthrown in the near future and that the rule of brute force will be replaced by a Democracy all at once. There will be transitional stages in which those who are united in rejecting the Dictatorship will begin to struggle with one another. But the sense of freedom and justice, which, as must unfortunately be admitted, has hitherto been little developed amongst the Germans in comparison with other nations, will be fortified in the school of suffering, and in the end a State will emerge in which unity between Government and People will be more than one of the phrases of mendacious demagoguery. Perhaps Hitler will figure in history as the man who, by destroying Democracy, prepared the way for the victory of Democracy.

RUDOLF BREITSCHIED.

THE INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF TRAFFIC IN DANGEROUS DRUGS.

IN the CONTEMPORARY REVIEW for 1912 I described the origin of the international effort to restrict the use of opium and other dangerous narcotic drugs to legitimate medical purposes, and in articles in 1923 and 1925 recorded the progress made under the League of Nations to effectuate the Opium Conventions and secure their universal operation. Since 1925 further progress has been made, fresh difficulties have been encountered in regard to illicit traffic, gaps in the international control of production and distribution of drugs of addiction have been disclosed, and it is evident that concentration and extension rather than relaxation of effort are required if the excessive manufacture of dangerous narcotics is to be arrested and the lucrative trade of international smugglers eliminated.

The League of Nations, after a report from its Health Section, arrived at the conclusion that the legitimate medical requirements of the world would be met by the annual production of nine tons of morphine, two tons of heroin and five and a half tons of cocaine. It has, however, to be borne in mind that morphine to the extent of some twenty tons is used for the manufacture of codeine and other preparations not hitherto scheduled as "Dangerous Drugs."

In 1931 a fresh Conference was assembled at Geneva with a view to amending or strengthening the Opium Convention of 1925 and securing the limitation of manufacture of the dangerous alkaloids derived from the poppy and coca leaves to strictly medical purposes, as indeed was contemplated by Article 9 of the original Hague Opium Convention of 1912. The Conference resulted in a new Convention for the limitation of manufacture of the narcotics in question, not, as was originally proposed, by national quotas, but in accordance with estimates supplied in advance by each of the signatory countries. The Convention also set up a new supervisory body, the Permanent Central Opium Board, to see that the estimates supplied are not exceeded and exercise control over international imports and exports. Reports made by the new Board appear to show that the statistics supplied by the various countries for the legitimate manufacture of morphine, heroin and cocaine are approximating to the estimates of

world requirements of these drugs as formulated by the League of Nations. Unfortunately, some producing countries are not parties to the several Conventions, and others, although signatories, have failed to supply the required statistics; while, over and above the amount of legitimate manufacture, there is abundant evidence of unrecorded or illicit production of narcotics in several countries. Great Britain, by the Dangerous Drugs Acts, 1920-32, has faithfully put into legislation and administration the undertakings contained in the Opium Convention of 1912 and the subsequent treaties. If all other parties to these obligations had proceeded with similar vigour the menace of the drug traffic would have become less than it still is.

Recent experience from Egypt suffices to show how resolute action can rapidly effect amelioration both nationally and internationally. T. W. Russell Pasha in 1930 astounded the Opium Advisory Committee of the League of Nations by declaring that during the previous five years Egypt had become a nation of drug addicts. It was estimated that some 500,000 were enslaved to narcotics and that they expended some millions of pounds annually on purchase of the "dope." Morphine, heroin, cocaine and hashish had been pouring into the country, and huge fortunes were being made by the skilled gangs of smugglers who organised the business. It was discovered that much of this contraband emanated from a drug factory in Alsace, and from this mid-European centre passed to Genoa, Trieste, Piræus, Constantinople and Cairo. It was indeed alleged that in 1928, from this one firm alone, 4,349 kilogrammes of heroin had issued, or more than enough to meet the legitimate requirements of the world. Russell Pasha, as Director of the Narcotics Bureau and Commandant of the Cairo Police, has tracked out, exposed and, by heavy fines and imprisonment, eliminated the chief agents of this lucrative and nefarious traffic in the Levant. Indeed, in his latest report he is able to claim that the number of convicted addicts undergoing imprisonment has fallen from 5,681 in 1929 to 674 in 1933, and he believes that the menace which threatened Egypt five years ago has been removed.

No sooner is one source of illicit manufacture of narcotics discovered and rooted out than others take its place. Three factories, on a large scale, of morphine and heroin in Istanbul were exposed and suppressed two years ago, and Turkey

was welcomed, at last, as adhering to the Opium Conventions. Shortly afterwards, however, interest was centred on Bulgaria, which has become a large opium producer and has been unmasked as harbouring ten secret factories of morphine and heroin, not less than 3,000 kilogrammes of the latter drug having issued therefrom during the past year.

Besides Turkey and the Balkan states, Persia, India and China are the chief producers of raw opium, and to them must now be added the new territory of Manchukuo. Persia has been reluctant, largely on financial and economic grounds, to fall into line with other Powers in the matter of the Opium Conventions. It has been reported that there are some 70,000 acres under poppy cultivation in Persia yielding 600 tons of opium annually, valued at £2,000,000 a year, equal to nine per cent. of the national revenue. One-fourth of the population is said to be directly or indirectly associated with the opium traffic and one in ten is said to smoke opium.

The Indo-Chinese opium trade was, of course, the chief subject of contention in "the opium question" last century, and in the early part of the present century a new policy for its progressive cessation was initiated by Lord (then Mr. John) Morley when Secretary of State for India in 1906, and that trade ceased in 1917. The undertaking that China would synchronously abolish the cultivation of the opium poppy was at first observed; but with the chaos following the fall of the Central Government there has been a lamentable recrudescence of opium production in that disturbed country. There is also too much reason to think that China has been the dumping ground of much illicit morphine and other alkaloids, and indeed it is stated that secret drug factories have been established and are increasing in number in China itself.

In 1929-31 a Commission was dispatched by the League of Nations to Bangkok to inquire into opium smoking in the Far East. The Hague Opium Convention of 1912 had contemplated "the gradual and effective suppression" of opium smoking and the "prohibition" of the traffic in "prepared" opium (for smoking) either immediately or as soon as possible. The protocol arrived at by the Geneva Conference in 1925, however, postponed the desired "suppression" until not more than fifteen years from a date when exports of raw opium from producing countries should no longer be an obstacle to such suppression. The Bangkok Commission

(on which China was not represented) made some valuable suggestions but very justly concluded that "the whole problem of poppy cultivation and its control enters very materially into the question of suppression of the opium-smoking habit," and "that the limitation and control of poppy cultivation will alone assure the total suppression of opium smoking."

India is, of course, still a large producer of opium, under Government monopoly, and continues to supply "prepared" opium for smoking to countries in the Far East, deriving considerable revenue therefrom. Lord Reading, when Viceroy in 1926, announced a new policy of progressive reduction of the export of opium except for strictly medical purposes. Among the countries supplied with opium from India are Crown Colonies like the Straits Settlements, North Borneo and the Federated Malay States, a considerable percentage of whose revenue is derived from opium. When my co-delegates and I were about to sign, on behalf of Great Britain, the first international Opium Convention of 1912 at The Hague, we were instructed to attach the following declaration :

The articles of the present Convention, if ratified by His Britannic Majesty's Government, shall apply to the Government of British India, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, Hong Kong, and Wei-hai-Wei in every respect in the same way as they shall apply to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

That the Indian Government should continue to be a considerable purveyor of opium for smoking gave rise to accusations of inconsistency at Geneva, and Mr. Lyall, the President of the Central Opium Board, has commented on the fact that smokers in the Crown Colonies bought opium from a Government that had given a solemn undertaking to suppress opium smoking. It is certainly anomalous that a person purveying opium for smoking in this country should be liable to a fine not exceeding £1,000 and possibly ten years' penal servitude, while the Indian Government continues to export opium for smoking at a handsome profit. One is reminded of the cynical dictum of Warren Hastings in regard to opium to the effect that "it is a pernicious article of luxury which ought not to be permitted but for the purpose of foreign commerce only."

The "Limitation of Manufacture" Convention of 1931 did not extend to the production of raw opium or of the leaves of the coca shrub, and it may be recalled that the American and Chinese delegates withdrew from the Geneva Conferences of 1925 because the control or restriction of the production of the raw materials was ruled out of the purview of those Conferences and excluded from the resultant Conventions. The American delegates maintained

(1) That if the purposes of the Hague Opium Convention are to be achieved according to its spirit and true intent, it must be recognised that the use of opium products for other than medicinal and scientific purposes is an abuse and not legitimate. (2) That in order to prevent the abuse of these drugs it is necessary to exercise the control of the production of raw opium in such a manner that there will be no surplus available for non-medicinal and non-scientific purposes.

These principles had been approved by the Assembly of the League of Nations and by its Health Committee, and it is good to know that now, at long last, instructions have been given to prepare the necessary data for a Conference which shall devise means for limiting the production of opium and coca leaves to the amounts required for strictly medical purposes, and thus cut at the root of the illicit and demoralising traffic in drugs of addiction.

WILLIAM COLLINS.

THE SATELLITE GARDEN TOWN.

EVERYBODY knows what a garden city is. Letchworth and Welwyn have become household names among those who are interested in the planning of a better England. Relatively few have heard of the *satellite* garden town, which is likely in the near future to be far more important than the garden city. Instead of the gradual sprawling growth which was typical of our cities in the last century, the satellite garden town should be deliberately planned by a great municipality so as to preserve permanently all the amenities of a large district, and to include not only houses and parks, but also a factory area ; the population working partly in the area and partly in the mother city.

The most imaginative and important enterprise which the Manchester City Council has undertaken for many years has undoubtedly been the development of the Wythenshawe satellite garden town, covering an area that will house about 100,000 persons, and will include a considerable number of factories. Many of the residents will not only live but work in Wythenshawe ; the remainder will live in Wythenshawe and work in Manchester or neighbouring areas. The development is on such a scale and has been so well planned that it is certainly the most important experiment in satellite garden town building which is now going on in England—and perhaps anywhere else.

The plan covers a total area of approximately 5,500 acres. The first decision was to reserve a permanent agricultural belt of 1,000 acres, so that whatever development may occur the residents shall always have access to green fields. The agricultural belt will also provide for all time cheap playing-fields, so that old-established cricket clubs will not be destroyed by the encroachment of the speculative builder, as has so often been their fate elsewhere. Apart from the agricultural belt another 1,000 acres is reserved for open spaces of one sort and another, including the preservation of the ancestral park of the Tatton family as a fine permanent open space of 250 acres. Another 100 acres is being reserved for a golf course : whereas a course rather farther out from Manchester, but in an unplanned area, is at the present moment threatened by the speculative builder.

One of the most original and important features of the plan for Wythenshawe development is its use of the parkway

system. There are to be two parkways running right through the estate. The parkway is an American invention ; it consists of a main road, used for through traffic only, and having wide margins planted with grass, trees, and beds of flowers on either side ; in the case of Wythenshawe parkways these margins average over 150 feet in width. Footpaths for pedestrians are provided along them. The houses which front on the parkway are, therefore, separated from the street by 150 feet of open space. Access is provided to the houses by subsidiary roads parallel to the parkway but on the farther side of the houses. Cars drawn up at the houses will be on the subsidiary roads ; these are connected at intervals of about a quarter of a mile with the parkway, the use of which is, therefore, confined to through traffic. This fact, combined with the reduction in the number of road junctions, renders possible much faster speeds without risk of accident than on ordinary roads. A further important advantage of the parkway is that it effectively prevents ribbon development, and from the extra value which the surrounding land acquires by reason of the amenities and convenience of the parkway, it may be expected that much of its cost will be recouped. Already a mile and a half of the parkway has been built and laid out with skill and taste ; anyone who walks or drives along it cannot fail to see what a beneficent revolution has been effected in comparison with the ordinary main road which is still being built almost everywhere else.

Three thousand acres are reserved for housing. The plan shows a minimum of four houses to the gross acre and a maximum of twelve ; altogether there should be about 25,000 houses, housing a population of 100,000 persons. Great care has been taken to preserve the natural beauties of the estate, the coppices and streams, and especially the thousands of fine trees. Schools are being built, largely on the open-air principle, and from five to ten acres of land are being allotted to each school. The two new schools which are now in full operation provide almost perfect surroundings for the children who are lucky enough to attend them. Having been planned before the development of the estate they have been so arranged that as far as possible the children attending them have no main roads to cross. A suitable site has been reserved for a civic centre ; old farms are being preserved ; one is already being used as a community centre, another as a

temporary church. Two hundred acres have been set aside as a factory area ; it will, of course, be a condition that the factories shall be smokeless and shall not be a nuisance in any way. Five factories are at present in course of erection, and will give employment to a considerable number of Wythenshaw residents under ideal conditions.

Manchester did not secure full control of the estate till 1931. Development was at once begun with great energy. Before anything substantial could be done in the way of building houses it was necessary to deal with the main drainage system. This was put in hand in 1930, and the first portion, providing for the first few thousand houses, was finished at a cost of £226,000 in about two years. Meantime access to the estate was limited to one narrow bridge over the Mersey. Further access had to be provided by a new bridge over the Mersey connecting up the parkway with one of the main avenues into Manchester. This was finished by 1932 at a cost to the city for the roadway and bridge which, thanks to a substantial grant from the Ministry of Transport, did not exceed £88,000.

It was not until 1932 that it was possible to begin with the actual work of building houses. In that year just over 400 houses were finished, in the following year well over 3,000. This was a magnificent beginning ; no doubt development would have continued on this high level but for the change in the Government's housing policy. Sir Hilton Young, in 1932, abolished the Wheatley Act under which these houses were being built ; and practically stopped municipal building for the time being in order to concentrate on slum clearance. The result is that at the time of writing the future rate of building of municipal houses in Wythenshaw is quite uncertain, depending as it does largely on Government policy. The following table shows the number of houses completed up to the time of writing :

Year ending	No. of houses completed	
December 31st, 1930 ...	...	142
„ 1931 ...	...	—
„ 1932 ...	...	411
„ 1933 ...	...	3,363
March 31st, 1934 ...	...	690
Total	...	<u>4,606</u>

In addition, since the incorporation of the area, the following houses have been erected by private enterprise, viz. :

Year ending December 31st, 1931	...	65	houses
" " " 1932	...	104	"
" " " 1933	...	100	"

Private enterprise has been building many thousands of houses in areas surrounding Wythenshawe, but for some reason has not yet taken up building on the estate with any vigour. One interesting point is, however, to be noted : the city is wisely using its power as landlord to control the amenity of the private-enterprise houses. Generally speaking, private enterprise is building quite good houses, but the speculative builder rarely employs an architect, with the result that the appearance of these estates is frequently deplorable. The City Council has tackled this problem by itself planning the estates which are to be used for private development, so as to secure a good layout and the preservation of trees and other amenities, and by insisting on the elevations and designs of all buildings being approved by Mr. Barry Parker. Those who have built houses and factories in Wythenshawe have welcomed his help (for which they do not pay!) ; the result is that the private-enterprise buildings are well planned and attractive ; in striking contrast to private-enterprise building in neighbouring areas.

Such is the plan which is being carried out by the Manchester City Council to-day. Contrast the way in which development took place in the nineteenth century : for example, in the neighbouring city of Salford. Salford grew in the normal nineteenth-century manner, with no plan and very little control. Every factory owner put his factory where he thought it would pay him ; every speculative builder put his houses where he liked, built them how he liked and at whatever density he liked, subject to a gradual development of control by by-laws as the century went on. The result is what we see in Salford to-day—an unplanned, chaotic, inconvenient, ugly and overcrowded city.

Those days are gone, but even to-day planning is far from perfect. The development of the land on the southern borders of Manchester, in the county of Cheshire, is not seriously planned. It is true that a regional plan is being

discussed ; but there does not seem to be any serious effort to plan these areas ahead as is being done in Wythenshawe. Agricultural belts and open spaces are not preserved ; the speculative builder ruthlessly mops up every open space out of which he hopes to make a profit.

The one form of development which is regarded as being typical of the twentieth century is the garden city. Welwyn and Letchworth are splendid examples of what can be done, and provide almost perfect conditions for the workers in their factories. But unfortunately their development has been exceedingly slow : they have both suffered from two things : lack of capital at low rates, and lack of people willing to come and live or build factories in them. The result is that in spite of much devoted work they have grown slowly, and that there are no signs to-day of other similar garden cities developing.

Wythenshawe is the first serious effort by a great city to produce a satellite garden town which offers amenities similar to those of the independent garden city. Wythenshawe, although effective work only began in 1931, has already a larger population than either Welwyn or Letchworth ; correspondingly more money has already been spent on its development. The reason for the difference is obvious : the Manchester City Council is in a position to provide the two things which Welwyn and Letchworth lack : cheap capital in whatever quantities it is required, and houses in large numbers to make the capital remunerative. There is no difficulty or danger in that kind of development so long as capital is available and development occurs sufficiently rapidly to make the capital invested in such things as main drains, roads, water, gas and electricity, productive without undue delay. Any great city can ensure these two conditions. Only a great city can ensure them. The Government could help the garden city movement by making cheap capital available, but it would be difficult for the Government which does not itself build houses or factories to ensure rapid development. A great city, which itself builds thousands of houses a year and is also the master of ample capital, can alone provide both the necessary conditions for success. That is the importance of the Wythenshawe experiment. If the garden city movement is to extend it must be sponsored by our great cities.

But the history of Wythenshawe shows that there are two further conditions which are vital to success. The first is that

the city must own the land, or at least the major part of the land. The powers of the city as local authority are limited to such powers as are expressly given by statute, and are totally inadequate to ensure satisfactory development. But the powers as landlord are limited only where actions are expressly prohibited by statute; the landlord can lease land subject to any conditions he likes to impose. It is the landlord power which is enabling Manchester to preserve the amenities of Wythenshawe in all kinds of ways which would not otherwise have been possible.

The second condition is that the city should also itself be the local authority for the satellite garden town. A little consideration will show this to be almost essential. Some services must be provided in advance of building, e.g. roads and sewers, others during the course of the building—specially schools. The city intending to build makes its decisions and has confidence in its own intentions to carry out these decisions; as we have shown, Manchester committed itself to an expenditure of many hundreds of thousands of pounds at Wythenshawe before a single house was built. If Wythenshawe had remained under the County Council, the County Council must inevitably have said to Manchester, "Yes, you intend to build. But suppose you do not carry out your intention? If we commit ourselves to the provision of roads, sewers and schools to serve a population which will inhabit five or ten thousand houses, and you then do not proceed, what is our position going to be? What guarantee can you give us that you will in fact build those houses?" Of course, the city can give no such guarantee, and a deadlock inevitably arises. It is clear that for large-scale development of satellite garden towns the whole of the land concerned must be included in the area of the city which is taking the responsibility for the building.

Parliament, to-day, is taking the view that no extension of cities should be allowed unless and until they can prove that their existing area is completely built up. So long as Parliament maintains this view the possibility of the building of satellite garden towns by our county boroughs is excluded. This seems to me to be narrow and short-sighted. Our great cities are still expanding; even though the population may not increase much more, the rebuilding of the slum areas at lower densities will force a large number of families from the

slums to the outskirts where they ought to be housed in garden cities. If Parliament maintains its present attitude they will be driven out into areas controlled by rural authorities which will be unplanned or ineffectively planned. The conditions may be fairly good but they will be far from the excellence of Wythenshawe.

If, on the other hand, great cities are not only allowed but encouraged to extend their borders and to purchase land, more Wythenshawes will grow up, and the twentieth century will be marked by the development of a series of satellite garden towns which will be one of its chief glories.

ERNEST SIMON.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN THE NEAR EAST.

EVENTS in Germany and Central Europe have diverted attention from the Near East, where many interesting and important changes have occurred during the last few months. The most noteworthy change is in Turko-Italian relations, and it is regrettable to have to record that these relations have greatly deteriorated. The deterioration dates from the spring, when Signor Mussolini made a speech in which he referred to the need of "Italian co-operation with (*or* expansion into) Asia." This utterance created considerable alarm in Turkey, and Vassif Bey, the Turkish Ambassador in Rome, was instructed to seek explanations from the Duce. Vassif Bey was told that the Italian Premier did not regard Turkey as being part of Asia, and that, therefore, the speech in question must not be considered as being directed against Turkey.

Such an explanation, it is needless to say, did not have much effect in Angora, and the Ghazi Mustapha Kemal at once left on a visit to Smyrna, Chanak, Balikisri and other strategical points in Western Anatolia. When he returned to Angora, the Ghazi summoned his Ministers, and after several protracted sittings of the Cabinet, Ismet Pasha, the Prime Minister, announced that the Army, Navy and Air Force were to be strengthened. The Grand National Assembly—the Turkish Parliament—at once voted a substantial credit, running into several millions of pounds sterling, for national defence. Many new taxes were levied, the proceeds of which, it was officially stated, would go to defray the increased expenditure on the fighting forces. Simultaneously, the Turkish Press published articles in which Signor Mussolini's speech was severely criticised.

It is extremely unfortunate—to put it mildly—that all this should have occurred, because Fascist Italy and Kemalist Turkey—two powerful Mediterranean powers—had gradually grown to esteem and admire each other. Students of Near Eastern politics will recall that ten years ago—when Great Britain and Turkey were quarrelling about the ownership of the Mosul oilfields—Signor Mussolini made a speech at Tripoli which frightened the Turks, and which was popularly supposed to have contributed not a little to the eventual peaceful

settlement between the Turks and ourselves. In any case, whether it was or was not intended as a threat to the Turks, the fact remains that from 1926 onwards Turko-Italian relations slowly but surely improved, until France, and perhaps other states too, became almost jealous.

The Duce played a prominent part in reconciling Turkey with Greece. He met Dr. Tewfik Rushdi Bey, the Turkish Foreign Minister, at Milan, where the basis of a Turko-Greek understanding was laid. Thereafter, Italy, through Signor Orsini Barone, her talented Ambassador in Angora, fostered by every means in her power the Turko-Greek Entente. It is, indeed, not too much to say that this Entente might never have come into existence if it had not been for Italy. Apart from politics, Italy was active in the economic and financial sphere. Italian banks and business firms interested themselves in Turkish affairs; a small financial credit was granted to Turkey by a leading Italian bank. The Turks placed orders for warships in Italian dockyards.

Despite this *rapprochement* between Rome and Angora, the fear of Italian expansion into Asia Minor had never entirely died away from Turkish hearts. The Turks knew, and know, as well as anybody else, that Italy has a large surplus population, and that it is becoming increasingly difficult for the Italian Government to know what to do with its citizens. Therefore, the Turkish General Staff was always on the *qui vive* and kept a careful watch on Italian naval and military activities. The fact that Italy owns several islands in the Dodecanese, which are unpleasantly close to the Turkish mainland, has always made the Turks a little anxious. Of recent years the fortification by the Italians of Leros and other islands in this archipelago has made the Turks doubly suspicious. This, incidentally, explains to a large degree the two unfortunate incidents which lately took place along the Ægean coast. In one instance a party of British naval officers, out for a bathe, were shot at by Turkish sentries, with the result that one officer was killed and another wounded. In the other case, an Italian fisherman was killed. It has now been learnt that Turkish sentries and coastguards along the Ægean seaboard have orders to prevent any unauthorised persons landing on their shores, using force if they deem it necessary. The actual instructions lay down that the sentries shall warn the occupants of any strange craft to stop; if they do not

obey orders at once, shots shall be fired into the air ; if this proves ineffective, the sentries have orders to open fire on the occupants. It can readily be understood that such orders can easily result in innocent blood being spilt, while it is also obvious that the Turks are very nervous and suspicious about the movements of any foreign craft along their coast.

Well-informed observers in Turkey and elsewhere do not really believe that Italy can have any hostile intentions towards the Kemalist Republic. It is argued that the debacle suffered by the invading Greek army only twelve years ago must be a warning to any other country which envisages attacking Turkey. In addition, the well-known fighting qualities of the Turks are thought to be yet another factor capable of making the Italians reflect before they embark on any Asiatic adventure. Whether these observers are right or wrong, it remains certain that Turkey is scared of Italian plans and designs, and this apprehension exercises a disquieting effect in the Near East.

Besides being suspicious of Italy, Turkey has for some time past not been too well disposed towards Bulgaria. The unwillingness of the Bulgarians to enter the Balkan Pact (concluded early this year in Athens between Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia, and Rumania) did not please the Turks, who regarded it as an unfriendly act. Consequently, Turko-Bulgarian relations have suffered, especially because the Turks believe that Rome and Sofia see eye to eye on many questions affecting the Balkans. The result of this has been a revival of Turkish interest in Eastern Thrace, the European province of the Kemalist Republic. The first step was the creation of an Inspectorate-General in Thrace ; Ibrahim Taly Bey, an able administrator, who had made his mark in Kurdistan, was appointed Inspector-General, with his headquarters at Adrianople. His task was to reorganise the civil administration, improve communications, and—perhaps unofficially—settle Turkish refugees in Thrace.

It cannot have been pure coincidence that just about the time that Ibrahim Taly Bey was sent to Adrianople several other events occurred in Thrace. First, the Turks renewed their demand to fortify the Straits, the northern banks of which are in Thrace. Secondly, important troop movements took place, it being alleged that the number of troops in Thrace was insufficient for national security. Thirdly, prac-

tically all the Jews, who happen to be Turkish subjects, living in Thrace and in the Gallipoli Peninsula, were persecuted and obliged to leave their homes. It is not, of course, suggested that Ibrahim Taly Bey was a party to this persecution ; it is, indeed, fairly certain that he was opposed to it. But it is certainly curious that all these events should have occurred almost simultaneously, and it is not unnatural that the Bulgarians should be nervous regarding Turkish intentions.

At present there is a "demilitarised zone" between Turkey and Bulgaria. Turkey, it is understood, would like this zone suppressed so as to be able to fortify Adrianople and/or the surrounding country. Bulgaria is believed to be opposed to the suppression of the zone. Another matter which has caused friction between Turkey and Bulgaria is the ill-treatment which the Turks allege that the Bulgarians are inflicting on their minorities in Bulgaria. There are about half a million Turks who have been living in Bulgaria for many years ; they are, in fact, relics of the days when Turkey owned what is now Bulgaria. The Bulgarians deny ill-treating these minorities, and, in their turn, accuse the Kemalist Turks of carrying on an active campaign among the minorities. This campaign is said to be aimed at making the minorities discontented and thus persuading them to return to Turkey. So far the alleged campaign would not seem to have met with much success, although some thousands of Moslems have recently arrived in Istanbul from Bulgaria.

It will thus be seen that Turkey is now not on good terms with Italy and Bulgaria. The writer would like, however, to stress the point that there is little danger of Turkey attacking Bulgaria ; but the Turks seem to feel that the Bulgarians may one day make common cause with Italy and cause them difficulties in Eastern Thrace.

Meanwhile, the Turkish Government has given an assurance to the British Government that, in view of the troubled state of affairs in Europe, it will refrain from raising the question of the fortification of the Straits for the time being. Despite this assurance, it is as certain as anything can be that the Turks are determined to fortify the Straits in the not far distant future. They argue—and there is a good deal to be said for their point of view, even if one does not agree with it—that they should have sovereignty over their own territory. In addition, they point out that Great Britain holds the key

to the western entrance to the Mediterranean at Gibraltar, so why should not they—who own the land bordering on both sides of the Straits—hold the key to the eastern entrance?

Soviet Russia has already made it known that she supports the Turkish demand, but the attitude of the other Great Powers who are signatories of the Straits Convention is not clear. These Powers are Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan. Given the actual state of Turko-Italian relations, it is unlikely that Italy will support the Turkish request; the attitude of France and Japan is one of expectancy; that of Great Britain would appear to be hostile, as we always stood for the "Freedom of the Straits." In practice, the Turks could, however, fortify the Straits within a few hours, whether the Great Powers were agreed or not, and this consideration is bound to carry a certain amount of weight when Turkey brings the question before the League of Nations.

Turkey's foreign policy has for the last few years been closely concordant with that of Russia. The Soviet proved to be Turkey's only friend when Western Europe backed the Greeks in their absurd Anatolian adventure, and the Turks have not forgotten this gesture. It would be, in fact, suicidal for Kemalist Turkey to fall out with Soviet Russia. Such a situation was at one time viewed with dismay in Western Europe, but to-day, with the evolution of Soviet foreign policy, it is a state of affairs which may prove to be a guarantee of peace. If Italy should ever make up her mind to attack Turkey with the object of settling a few million of her subjects in Asia Minor, a warning from Moscow that she will find herself opposed to Russian, as well as Turkish, soldiers should have a salutary effect.

Yet another way in which the Soviet can be helpful to Near Eastern peace lies in the Balkans. During the summer the Russians and the Bulgarians resumed diplomatic relations after a lapse of about seventeen years. A Russian Minister will soon be appointed to Sofia, and he will be able to witness at close quarters the difficulties against which Bulgaria is battling. It would not be surprising if the Russians used their influence to bring about a better feeling between Angora and Sofia. The policy of the Soviet in the Near East has undergone a vast change in the last few years. Formerly, the Russians were interested in the stirring up of "Red" propaganda and their activities were viewed with the greatest apprehension

throughout the Peninsula. To-day, the Russians, while still eager to spread Communistic doctrines, are also anxious to keep the peace, as they realise that they will be the losers, and not the gainers, by any European upheaval.

Yet another interesting development in the Near East is the attempt at a Turko-Persian understanding. The Shah Pahlavi of Persia has just concluded a state visit to Turkey. He stayed in the country for about three weeks and was the guest of Ghazi Mustapha Kemal. After three days of official celebrations in Angora, the two rulers went on a tour of the provinces, and it was noticeable that Kemal showed the Shah military aerodromes, naval bases, and munition factories, while imposing military reviews were held in his honour.

On good authority it is learned that Turkey was anxious to enter into a military agreement with Persia, but the Shah, so it appears, was unwilling to commit himself. His visit to Turkey had been planned for a long time, but had always been postponed. The Persians wanted the Ghazi to promise that he would return the Shah's visit ; the Turks refused to give this promise, but eventually the Shah decided to make the voyage to Angora without obtaining the much desired assurance. Various reasons are advanced for the Shah's refusal to entertain the Turkish proposal of a military understanding ; first, it is surmised that His Majesty did not want to commit himself to any arrangement which might not win Russian approval and which might also arouse suspicions in Great Britain. Secondly, the Shah may have thought that Turkey had more to gain by a military understanding than Persia had. In any case, the Shah's attitude did not satisfy the Turks, and there was a marked change in the cordiality which had at first attended his visit.

It is now necessary to refer to the Balkan Pact—that unfortunate instrument which was so hurriedly concluded in Athens in January of this year, and which has since been the cause of much unseemly bickering in Greece. It is now generally conceded that the Pact—as it stands at present—is a failure. The avowed object of the four signatory Powers was to further the cause of peace in the Near East. So far, the only result which has been achieved is that the interests of the “Haves” have been furthered at the expense of the “Have-nots,” for the aim of the Balkan Pact is the maintenance of the *status quo*. Yugoslavia, Rumania and Greece all gained vast

strips of territory after the Great War ; Turkey lost much of her Asiatic territory, but the Treaty of Lausanne conferred other benefits upon her.

Bulgaria, on the other hand, suffered great injustices after the War, and none of these injustices have been removed. Situated as she is in the centre of the Balkans Bulgaria must be a party to any Balkan Pact which is to prove of any value. Successive Bulgarian Governments have, however, been unwilling to adhere to a Pact which would spell complete renunciation of all their claims. In this refusal they have had, to a certain degree, the support of Yugoslavia, which has recently shown herself better disposed towards her Slav neighbour. It is very unlikely that Bulgaria will join the Pact unless the clauses thereof are radically remodelled, and the same consideration applies to Albania, which has also preferred to remain outside.

Yet another danger threatens the Balkan Pact. This concerns the attitude which any one of the signatory Powers would have to adopt if another one were attacked by a country which is not a signatory to the Pact. If, for example, Italy attacked Turkey, would Greece be obliged to go to Turkey's assistance ? This is a point which M. Venizelos raised in the Greek Parliament and which has never been satisfactorily settled, because the wording of the Pact is apparently open to several different interpretations. If, of course, Greece found herself obliged, under the Pact, to assist Turkey, then a most dangerous situation would ensue, and most, if not all, of the Near Eastern Powers would find themselves involved in a war which was no direct concern of theirs. Enough has been written to show that the Balkan Pact is a thoroughly nebulous instrument, which, it is to be hoped, will soon be denounced by all the interested parties.

No mention has yet been made of the rôle which is being played by France in the Near East. At the time of writing, French influence stands very high in the Balkans and in Turkey—higher than it has stood at any time during the last twenty years. The reason is that France is strong, is rich, knows what she wants and has not been afraid to pursue a continuous policy. Turko-French relations were strained for many years ; partly because of the squabble over the Ottoman Debt, partly because of the vexed question of the Syrian frontier. Now that these two matters have been amicably settled, there is nothing to separate France from Turkey.

Rumania and Yugoslavia belong to the Little Entente, which is France's creation, while even Greece is now very susceptible to French advice. On account of the better feeling which has characterised Anglo-French relations in the Near East during the past few years, there is no need for us to view with anything but favour the increase in French prestige. Indeed, provided that it does not spell too many commercial contracts for French firms, we should encourage this current of opinion among the various Near Eastern races. Our policy is necessarily a more detached one than that of Continental nations, but there is more in common between us and the French than there is with any other great European Power.

Before concluding, it may be worth while to see who is governing the Near Eastern nations. Turkey still has Ghazi Mustapha Kemal and Ismet Pasha, the Prime Minister, not forgetting Fevzi Pasha, the Chief of the General Staff. All these men are as vigorous as ever, and their policy, if necessarily autocratic, seems well suited to Turkey. Greece is governed by old politicians who spend much time wrangling about internal questions. MM. Tsaldaris and Venizelos will, it is thought, soon have to make way for younger men who have more drive. On the other hand, Greece still remains one of the few European states where the parliamentary system of government is held in respect.

Bulgaria presents a thorny problem—both for her rulers and for foreign statesmen. King Boris has, it is to be feared, lost some of his grip, and the political situation is uncertain. The actual Premier, Colonel Kimon Georghieff, is a young and practically untried man. Most of the elder politicians are discredited. Yugoslavia has King Alexander, who is a tower of strength and who shows no signs of losing his control over the Triune Kingdom. In Rumania, King Carol is not too secure on his throne and a Fascist outbreak is always a possibility. Albania has King Zog, but the Italians are known to be dissatisfied with his attitude and his rule may not last for long.

All the six states are suffering from economic and financial troubles, and despite the talk of a Balkan Customs Union nothing tangible has yet been achieved in this direction. Still, all things considered, the Near East is calmer than it usually is, and the only real cloud in the sky is the state of relations prevailing between Turkey and Italy.

Constantinople.

J. WALTER COLLINS.

SOME MEMORIES OF GLADSTONE.*

I TRUST that Lord Gladstone and other members of the family who are present will not consider me frivolous if I introduce a few personal anecdotes ; nor will think me guilty of the fault of obtruding myself if I recount incidents of which I was an eye-witness. My only object is to give greater life and reality to the presentment. In the first place, what was his outward aspect ? How would some observant person, who saw him when in his full vigour, have described him ?

He was of sturdy and athletic build, slightly above middle height, light and springy in walk, rapid in gestures, somewhat pale of countenance, of strongly marked features, the nose aquiline, with compressed lips and deep-set and commanding eyes. He looked you straight in the face, and you somehow felt that he expected your own gaze to be as direct as his own. But the wonder and charm of his voice ! Who shall describe it ? The deep, melodious baritone, wielded with incomparable although unconscious skill, and capable of every variety of inflexion ! Some rather shallow people seem to think that there is a certain amount of insincerity in the artistic use of a great variety of tones. I have heard such a person say, after a great oration, full of moving passages, " All very fine, no doubt, but too like an actor," with the unspoken inference that the orator, preacher or lawyer was only simulating emotions, just as an actor infuses an air of reality into a part depicting imaginary sensations. The answer to this is surely obvious. The skilled actor reproduces the actual tones of passion, pity, indignation or irony which he hears in the voice of able speakers when they are genuinely moved by these respective feelings. The tones themselves are natural, as natural as Nature can make them, although it is not given to everyone to possess them, nor, even when possessing them, to reproduce them with full effect. Their absolute naturalness is proved by the immediate response which they awaken in the breasts of all who hear them ; and hence we may draw the exactly opposite conclusion from that of the critic who maintains that perfection and intensity of delivery implies insincerity, namely that the greater the vehemence and naturalness of the tones of the speaker the more likely was he to be profoundly convinced of the truth of what he was saying.

* Address given on Founder's Day (June 29th) at St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden.

It would not, I fancy, be far wide of the mark if we said that, generally speaking, the two dominating motives in Mr. Gladstone's life were, first, the pursuit and acquisition of the knowledge of essentials, and, secondly, the impressing this knowledge upon the mind and conscience of others. This disposition might perhaps be described as "the missionary spirit"; but whereas the missionary, strictly so-called, is only, or at any rate mainly, concerned with the duty of impressing one aspect of the truth upon his hearers, he was strongly drawn to convert and convince those with whom he came into contact, whenever the subject and occasion seemed of sufficient import. In short, if we were to ask ourselves whether he were what is called of an argumentative spirit, the best answer would be that, whilst gifted to a high degree with the power of argument, he rarely, if ever, argued for the sole pleasure of doing so, but only in order to bring his interlocutor round to his own view. He had not the fencer's delight in swordplay for its own sake; he reasoned to convince, and not to disable.

Again, it has been asked whether he were ambitious. When the late Lord Morley and my father were his guests at Hawarden, he asked the former whether he thought that he was ambitious. With a characteristic uplift of eyebrow, Morley answered that he could hardly doubt it. He turned to my father, who agreed with Mr. Morley. "Well," he said, "you are both wrong. You may think I am, and the world probably thinks so, but I am not." He then went on to say that it was true that he continuously strove for power, but only to be able to promote what seemed to him a useful, and to prevent a dangerous, policy. The weight of responsibility was a burden, the ceremonies were a weariness to the flesh. Even the power of awarding appointments, titles and honours brought more perplexity and anxiety than profit or pleasure. Perhaps he remembered Talleyrand's saying that, when you conferred a post, out of a hundred candidates you made ninety-nine enemies and one ungrateful man.

His conscientiousness in this connection was excessive, especially in making ecclesiastical appointments. Whenever a Church dignitary died, groans resounded in the Secretaries' room; not solely on account of grief for the loss of a good man, but because we knew how many hours of our Chief's precious time would be swallowed up in weighing the respective

claims of candidates. Besides examining all the recommendations which poured in on him from every quarter, he wrote numerous inquiries to all and sundry whom he thought qualified to help him in his choice. The Secretaries sighed for the days of Palmerston, who used, if rumour is to be trusted, to hand over all ecclesiastical appointments to Lord Shaftesbury, and trouble himself no further in the matter. Indeed, I was once so bold as to suggest to my colleagues that we should ask our Chief to let us undertake all preliminary investigations, but this suggestion was promptly squashed, on the ground that he would never allow it, and that if he did, we should make so many mistakes as only to add to his trouble. As I am on the subject of ecclesiastical preferment I may relate a story which Mr. Gladstone narrated with much gusto. A certain Bishop Philpott was regarded as giving too large a share of preferments to his own family and relatives. A friend once ventured to throw out a hint to that effect. "Not at all, my dear Sir," the good Bishop answered, "all the young men to whom I give preferment are excellent young men. I do not prefer them because they are my relatives, but because being my relatives I naturally know them well, and knowing them well I can judge of their fitness for the posts to which I nominate them. It is true that other people recommend young men whom I have never heard of; but in such cases I had much rather trust my own knowledge and judgment than theirs." Mr. Gladstone could certainly not be accused of nepotism, and he was apt to be suspicious of unsolicited recommendations. In answering these he was always careful to put in a saving clause, which ran, "that he would carefully examine Mr. X's claims and qualifications, in conjunction with those of other candidates."

We have heard him at times described as disingenuous, and it is worth while to examine how such a charge can have been brought against a man who in all his public as well as his private actions was the very soul of honour. The charge, which was often laid and sometimes quite sincerely, must, I think, have had its origin as follows. Like many men of accurate mind, capable of deep and subtle distinctions, he was especially anxious to avoid ambiguities, which would obscure or distort his meaning. Conscious that a change in circumstances might necessitate a corresponding change of policy, he wished to anticipate and provide for such contingencies as

far as possible, and so free himself from a charge of wanton or capricious change of front. In order to effect this he often resorted to exceptions, provisions and conditions, frequently included in a parenthesis. But however seemingly involved his sentences might appear in consequence of these parentheses, to anyone who followed them closely they were always perfectly co-ordinated and carried out, not only with grammatical, but also with logical exactness. These sometimes perplexed the duller witted of his hearers and gave a pretext to the more malicious of his opponents for alleging that they were only so many devices, or loopholes of escape, for freeing himself from what seemed to be pledges. In fact, it was his very anxiety to avoid ambiguity which caused him to be accused of it. Now there was a further development of this, which it is interesting to trace. Casuistry, whether good or bad (for there can be good casuistry as well as bad, although the word generally bears an ill meaning, especially to English ears), is often connected with the methods of the Jesuits. His critics argued as follows: "Mr. Gladstone is known to be a High Churchman, he uses subtle distinctions, so do the Jesuits, therefore Mr. Gladstone is a Jesuitical casuist." Not very good logic, though sufficiently so to the mentality of men who were not trained logicians, nor were exactly prejudiced in his favour.

I have been asked whether he were an exacting master. He certainly expected those who served him to give him of their best, and so long as they did this he was satisfied. He was never unreasonable, never unjust, hardly ever showed irritation and then very seldom against individuals. One very hot afternoon in the summer of 1880, when the thermometer was at 90 degrees, I had to make a *précis* from various flimsies which had come over from the Foreign Office relating to the difficulties and delays caused by the Unspeakable Turk in carrying out the provisions of the Treaty of Dulcigno, after the close of the Russo-Turkish War. I settled down to my work, and unfortunately in a big armchair, but as I had been dancing for several nights up to two or three in the morning, gradually the boundaries of Thessaly, the delimitation of Montenegro, the procrastination of the Sublime Porte, all melted into one beatific haze. Suddenly a door was thrown open, a violent draught sent all the flimsies whirling about the room, and the Prime Minister stood before me. All that

he said was "I shall be glad to have that précis when it is ready," adding, as an afterthought, "An armchair is not a very good thing to work in, in such hot weather." I can hardly bear to think of it even now.

The Secretaries took it in turns to attend on Sunday mornings at 10 o'clock for any urgent work which might have to be done. One day, in mid July, when it was my turn of duty, I slightly overslept myself, but got to Downing Street in time by going without my breakfast. When the work was done Mr. Gladstone said, "Where are you going to church?" I had not the courage to say that I was going to walk across the Park to the St. James's Club for a late breakfast, so gave a non-committal reply. "Then you had better come on with me to Marylebone, to hear Canon Barker; he preaches an excellent sermon." This was more in the nature of a command than of an inquiry; so off we went at four miles an hour in the blazing sun. On the way he discoursed volubly on the Council of Trent, a subject with which I had only a bowing acquaintance. In the course of this he said, without any irony, for he always thought that everybody had the same range of information as himself, "You remember, of course, what Fra Paolo Sarpi said?" I had to confess my ignorance not only as to what had been said, but as to who it was that had said it. He stopped dead: "What! You don't mean to say that you never even heard of Fra Paolo Sarpi!" I put in a humble demurrer that I had taken my degree in Greats and not in History, but even this did not seem to lessen his surprise. After the service he kindly invited me to go back with him to luncheon, so away we went again at the same brisk pace. By luncheon time I was fairly famished, and, as local reporters say, "did full justice to the ample repast." Mr. Gladstone thereupon remarked: "I always say that there is nothing to give you a good appetite like a walk to and from church on a Sunday morning." I did not dare to add, "and having had no breakfast."

As another illustration of the way in which he expected everybody to be well informed, I may mention an incident, when I was taking up some papers to him, in 1880, when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer. He turned round and flashed out a question: "What was the Sugar Duty in 1842?" "I will look it up, Sir." "What! You don't know?" Hereupon I could not help rejoicing, although I fear that

it was hardly respectful: "I should have thought, Sir, that is a question that would come more naturally from me to you." He was not at all offended at the freedom of my remark, and only said: "You are quite right; it was I who should have known what it was."

It has been said that he was deficient in humour. This is not the case, though it is true that he naturally took a serious view of any subject which might be mooted, and did not look at everything from a jocular aspect. Indeed, joking upon certain topics he regarded not only as bad taste, but quite impossible. You felt this instinctively, and I know of no instance of any questionable jest being made in his presence. As you sometimes see a notice in France, "*Chasse réservée*," so, not only did he never cross these forbidden boundaries, but, in his hearing, humorists were strictly warned off the premises.

Apart from these restrictions, nobody had a more genuine and spontaneous sense of fun. At Walmer Castle, when my uncle, Lord Granville, was Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports, Mr. Gladstone was his guest in the early 'eighties. My cousins, who were then children, were going to a circus at Deal one afternoon, and Mr. Gladstone insisted on accompanying them, saying that it was long since he had seen a circus. He enjoyed the fun as much as anybody, he courteously returned the dignified ringmaster's respectful bow, beamed on the young lady in spangles when she jumped through the paper hoops, was interested in the strong man's effort in painfully raising the enormous weights of cardboard painted to look like masses of iron, and roared with delight at the clown's most well-worn jokes and antics. All the time he was quite unconscious that he was more the centre of attraction to the audience than the performers in the ring. The onlookers were enchanted to see him enjoying himself, and without realising it he was the leader of the applause. As we were leaving he sent for the proprietor and complimented him on the performance. The proprietor conveyed to me in a whisper that if, in his own language, I could get the old gentleman there to-morrow it would be a fiver in my pocket. I resisted the temptation, but the town was placarded the next day with posters announcing the performance as patronised by the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary.

Mr. Gladstone often honoured my father by staying at

Holmbury, our house in the Surrey hills. It was at a time when the Irish partisans of physical force were making themselves prominent by dynamite explosions and threats to the lives of Ministers. Detectives were accordingly sent down by the Home Office to act as his bodyguard. This was no easy task, as he resented their presence apparently more than he was disturbed at the possibility of attack. It was my anxious duty to inform the detectives of his probable movements and to arrange with them how they could keep in touch with him without his noticing them.

It was on one of these visits that he enjoyed a feast of gooseberries in the kitchen garden. Indeed, he ate so many that Mrs. Gladstone grew apprehensive and asked my father to stop him. My father said that he really could not prevent his guest from eating his fruit if he liked it ; so Mrs. Gladstone took the bull by the horns and said : " William, dear, I don't think you ought to eat so many." " And, pray, why not ? " " Well, you see," sinking her voice to a confidential whisper, " I am afraid that there won't be enough left for Mr. Leveson's guests." Although this was a wildly improbable reason, as there were enough gooseberries to feed a regiment, the hint was enough for a man of his courtesy and consideration to cause him at once to desist.

Any intimate account of Mr. Gladstone would be indeed imperfect if it did not include a tribute to that kind and gracious lady, the loving partner of his life and partaker of his joys and sorrows. Whilst fulfilling—and more than fulfilling—all her duties to their numerous family, she was ever the careful guardian of his health and comfort, ever watchful to relieve him of anxieties and importunities, ever eager to promote his relaxation and amusement. Not only was she a loving wife and a devoted mother, but her great and noble heart was ever ready to alleviate, as far as in her lay, whatever tidings of sorrow, suffering, sickness, or distress came to her knowledge. Among those who were privileged to know and to love her who can forget the little nod of sympathy, the quick smile of understanding, or the warm and ready clasp of her friendly hand ? At that last sad moment in Westminster Abbey, when we saw the Heir to the Throne bend to kiss that hand, all felt that it was a tribute not only royally bestowed but worthily rendered in her bereavement to a great and noble lady.

Mr. Gladstone was an admirable conversationalist. He was at his ease with everybody, and in consequence, in spite of his rather alarming appearance, made everyone at ease with him. He was interested in everything, except gossip. I remember his having a long chat with a fine old yeoman, a neighbour of ours in Surrey, on the rearing of chickens, when he delighted old Mr. Hamshire by the shrewdness of his questions and remarks. When he was at Sir Charles Tennant's house, The Glen, in Peeblesshire, during one of his Midlothian campaigns, he was nowhere to be found when it was time to start for a big meeting. At last he was discovered at the end of the garden engaged in an animated discussion with the head gardener as to the merits and demerits of a new kind of American axe. The gardener apologised for having detained him, and afterwards said: "'deed, but ye wad ha'e thocht that he'd naething in his mind but axes."

On landing at Inverness, after a five weeks' cruise in 1885 in the Norwegian Fiords with Sir Thomas (afterwards Lord) Brassey on his well-known yacht, *The Sunbeam*, he made a point of shaking hands with every one of the crew, down to the cabin-boy. I remember that during this cruise we had to cross on foot a foaming river by a rough wooden bridge, through the planks of which you could see the rushing waters below. Although the bridge was some ten feet wide, he asked me to give him my arm, as anything of that kind made him very giddy. I remember being surprised that a man of such powerful intellect and will should be affected in this way.

He was considerate; and very courteous, not only in demeanour but in fact. I think it was in 1891, when we were in Opposition, that I was asked to speak in the House, on a motion in favour of the Redistribution of Seats. I was called on by the Speaker just before the dinner hour, when it is the custom that the sitting is adjourned for half an hour. At the end of that time the Member who had been called upon before the adjournment has to be in his place and begin his speech. Naturally in these circumstances the audience is scanty. On this occasion when I rose there were exactly four other Members present; but one of them was my old Chief. I spoke from the bench behind the Front Opposition Bench, upon which he sat immediately beneath me, gazing full in my face, with hand to ear as though eager not to miss a syllable. It was an act of pure kindness on his part and a great honour;

but all the same it was an appalling experience. I felt exactly like a small boy in Lower Remove sent for by the Headmaster to give an unseen construe, in order that the Head might see how he was getting on. I was conscious that if I made a mess of it, it might prejudice my future career. The poor little speech, such as it was, was made in dead silence; there was nobody to cheer, though once or twice he encouraged me by a sign of approval; there were not even interruptions or objections to enliven things by affording opportunity for a rejoinder. Needless to say how glad I was when it was over. Not content with his goodness in curtailing his dinner hour, Mr. Gladstone was so kind as to write a charming little note to my father, which greatly touched us both.

It is now time to pass from these personal reminiscences to some consideration of his general policy and method of dealing with public business. It would obviously be improper, on this occasion, to enter upon a defence or advocacy of his political measures; but it might not be out of place to observe that, whilst the political parties to which he was attached at various periods were different, the main lines of thought which guided him throughout his life were the same. From the time when, as a young man, he was the hope of the stern, unbending Tories, during the intermediate phase when he followed Peel on the disruption of the Tory Party through the repeal of the Corn Laws, and down to the closing period of his career when he gradually grew more and more in sympathy with the views of the more advanced wing of the Liberal Party, his leading principles, as I previously remarked, did not vary.

How can these be most readily summed up? In the first place a consistent love of peace, and as a corollary to this a constant desire for franker and better relations with foreign Powers; in the second place an ardent pursuit of economy, whereby the nation's resources might be fostered and strengthened, concurrently with an ever-increasing standard of comfort and well-being for all classes, especially the poorest, of the community; and lastly a gradual but progressive extension of the powers of self-government both in the spheres of imperial and local administration. These three leading principles have been aptly summarised in the phrase "Peace, Retrenchment and Reform." This phrase has been by custom attached to one political party, but the aims which it symbolises are so universal and their advantages so obvious, that there is no

reason why it should not be adopted in its widest sense as a watchword by any political party in the nation.

I may recall three especially illuminating remarks made to me by Mr. Gladstone. The first, in which he pointed out that the yield of Income Tax varied substantially according to the prosperity of the nation, how in good times taxable incomes were not only far more numerous than in times of depression, but that their individual, as well as aggregate, amount was much higher. So that one penny of Income Tax in times of prosperity brought in more revenue than a tax of three or four pence in a season of depression.

I once asked him whether he did not think it unfair that the rate of duty should be the same on all grades of tobacco, and that the poor man should have to pay as much duty per pound on the cheapest tobacco as the rich man paid per pound on the costliest Havana cigar. He said that he had considered this, but had given up the idea of differentiating the duty, chiefly for the following reasons. In the first place it was very difficult to assess the exact value of the tobacco or cigar, a difficulty which would occasion much dispute and delay; and, secondly, that as the poorer classes were untaxed in all the necessities of life (as they happily were in those days) and were exempt from Income Tax and similar imposts, it was but fair that they should contribute a certain moderate amount to the revenue of the country.

His third remark related to the composition of political parties. He observed, and, as it seems to me, very justly, that it was far preferable that the dividing lines between parties should be vertical rather than horizontal. By which he meant that each party should include within itself elements of different social, economic and cultural strata. In other words, that a man or woman should not say to himself or herself "I will join this party because I am rich," or "such another party because I am poor"; but that each should be guided in his preference by his intellectual or moral judgment and not by material or class considerations. He saw, and none more clearly, that if political parties became thus limited to a contest between the "Haves" and the "Have-nots," the standards of political thought would fall and political contests be degraded to an undignified, sordid and perilous scramble.

And now with reference to his Foreign Policy. This was animated in the first place by an ardent love of freedom, which

he believed to be the chief means whereby men became good citizens and useful to their own country and to the world at large. He desired that the rights of other nations should be respected by Great Britain, as fully as we required ours to be respected by them. He had a more than usual horror of war as a means of enforcing political decisions, and an equally strong desire to substitute arbitration in its place.

It was not in Mr. Gladstone to "prophesy smooth things, to prophesy deceits," and his very vigour of denunciation and a certain masterful impatience of obstacles often thwarted his measures and gave the victory to his opponents. The fact is, like many great and good men, he had too high an opinion of human nature. A lovable fault indeed, and how far better than the opposite defect of under-valuing everybody and everything. When a course of action struck him as being just and right, he perhaps did not always pause to ask himself whether at the moment it was feasible. His quick intelligence did not always realise that some novel aspect of truth which rapidly commended itself to him, was only borne in more slowly and gradually—sometimes even painfully—upon less sensitive and receptive minds. Then again, in his ardour in pursuit of an aim he made small allowance to his adherents if they occasionally slackened in their efforts or did not respond with the ready zeal which he expected. For the same reasons he under-rated, even if he gave them a thought at all, the effectiveness of honours and rewards, of little flatteries and attentions, which go so far to encourage the wavering and confirm the doubtful. He cared for none of these things, why, therefore, he thought, should others? At any rate, he would say to himself, he had far too much to do and far too little leisure to waste time on conciliating support by such methods as these.

As an instance of this I may mention the way in which he occupied every spare minute, in the lobbies of the House during a Division, with his correspondence, writing for dear life until the Teller's cry of "Door! Door!" summoned lingerers to vote. More than once when I was a Whip, I ventured to interrupt him by asking whether I might bring up for a moment or two some supporter who would have greatly prized a few words from him. He generally glanced up impatiently and said "No! No! not now. Can't you see that I'm busy? Some other time, perhaps." But that "other

time " never came, for he was always busy. In passing, one may notice that the Prime Ministers who were the greatest adepts in these arts of personal conciliation were Fox, Canning, Palmerston, Disraeli and Mr. Lloyd George ; whilst those who neglected such means of strengthening their position with their immediate followers, besides Mr. Gladstone, were Pitt, Wellington, Peel, Russell and Lord Salisbury.

Moreover, he was always, so to speak, at concert pitch, ready to press forward in a moment. This gave him his almost unique power of raising wave after wave of enthusiastic response to his glowing appeals to the nation. But he sometimes forgot that popular enthusiasm is apt to die down or to be diverted into other channels, and that persistence is one of the rarest and hardest of the virtues.

However, his work remains. Much he effected with his own hand and in his life ; more has been and will be accomplished through his guidance and example. He has been a shining light and an inspiration to many. The seed of his eloquence and teaching has borne fruit in many hearts and minds, and these again will hand on to those who come after them the message of wisdom and goodwill. Indeed of him it may be truly said :

For this abides amongst us yet
Of those who won their way to fame,
The echo of a long regret,
The shadow of a mighty name.

GEORGE LEVESON GOWER.

SCIENCE AND THE COAL INDUSTRY.

THERE has been an enormous advance in our knowledge of the right use of our coal supplies since Professor Jevons published his book on the Coal Question in 1865. His son made a prophecy in 1915 that in 1931 we should be raising 396,000,000 tons of coal a year and exporting 172,000,000 tons. The advance of science both here and in other coal-producing countries, together with the utilisation of foreign oil, has falsified those figures. During the last ten or twelve years the demand for coal has declined, with the result that some 300,000 or 400,000 miners have been thrown out of work and over 200,000 must be regarded as permanently unemployed. The present production of coal is about 207,000,000 tons a year, and as compared with 1923 is only about half its value. Apart, therefore, from the heavy charge on the Unemployment Insurance Fund and the terrible suffering involved in the case of the miners and their families, the right utilisation of coal must be of immense importance. We are now beginning to see that the burning of coal in the raw state is a wasteful method of employing the energy of coal, and gas undertakings have led the way in showing how great economies can be effected. A ton of coal will now produce a much larger number of therms of gas than was formerly the case, a saving in fact of more than forty per cent. during the last twenty years, but in addition to that immense saving there is the fact that with the combined output of gas, coke, coal tars, and chemical by-products we can now claim that an up-to-date gas undertaking gives us eighty per cent. of the energy value of the coal. We may even improve on this in the future. For the moment it is sufficient to say that just as the gas undertakings by constant research have made efficient the production of gas, so science has improved the efficiency of boilers where raw coal is used, and the coke ovens where metallurgical coke is produced. An immense saving has thus been made in the production of iron and steel. The latest developments in the economical use of coal consist in low temperature carbonisation, providing in the main a smokeless fuel, and the hydrogenation of coal, the principal product of which is high grade petrol and middle oils.

We cannot ignore this question of oil, since oil is taking the place of coal both at sea and on land, and the ships of the British Navy and a very large number of big passenger vessels

are driven by steam which is raised by the burning of oil. The percentage of ships burning coal has fallen from 88·84 per cent. in 1914 to 53·56 per cent. in 1933. It does not follow, of course, that oil will continue this rate of progress, for it obviously has some disadvantages; but it is important to remember that the displacement of coal owing to increase in the use of imported oil has amounted to 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 tons during the last few years. It seems obvious that oil, petrol, gas, and electricity are taking the place of the burning of raw coal, and this will mean a saving in the amount of coal used, though it is too soon to say how far the coal miners will suffer by this more economical use of coal. One other point seems fairly conclusive, and that is that the use of raw coal for domestic consumption will gradually decrease. To-day the housewife much prefers to use gas for cooking and heating, and however much we may like the coal fire we have to acknowledge that only one-fifth of the heat contained in the coal is utilised in this form, and the rest finds its way into the atmosphere which it pollutes, with resultant injury not only to our vegetation but also to our clothes and our buildings. Moreover, we are losing by the burning of coal in its raw state valuable tars, oils and other by-products which are of great commercial value. So far as the actual damage is concerned, it is estimated to cost the country nearly £40,000,000 per annum.

The two important experimental industries to which reference has already been made, viz. low temperature carbonisation and the hydrogenation of coal are, in a sense, linked together, since hydrogen can be utilised to improve the heavy tars of low temperature carbonisation. Science has now taught us how to make hydro-carbon oils from coal, and in this way coal may be able in the future to compete with oil from other countries. For some years past we have been in the habit of using National Benzole Mixture, which is one of the results of high temperature carbonisation. Benzole is obtained partly from the gas and partly from the tar, but mainly from the gas by a process which is described as "scrubbing" the gas with oil. In this way we get an excellent motor fuel, but, of course, only the most modern gas-works recover the benzole, although the number is gradually increasing. At the moment it is estimated that 25,000,000 gallons are being produced in this way. Another great improvement is in the manufacture of coke for metallurgical

purposes. When the beehive ovens were in regular use all the gas and benzole and other by-products were lost, but the recovery ovens have effected an immense saving and if they were in common use it is estimated that the amount of refined benzole available would be something like 60,000,000 gallons. In addition the coke ovens have so cheapened the production of iron and steel that the amount of coal required for the production of one ton of iron has been greatly reduced.

For the production of oil and motor spirit from coal, the method known as hydrogenation is the most successful. In 1933 the Prime Minister made an offer that the Government preference of 4d. a gallon would be allowed on the home-produced motor spirit, with the result that the Imperial Chemical Industries produced plans for building at Billingham-on-Tees a plant which would cost £7,000,000. That scheme has been somewhat modified, but the cost of the new plant now being constructed will be about £2,500,000, which, added to the existing plant already carried out, will mean that something like £4,000,000 will have been spent on this experiment. Will this huge expenditure be justified? The method is so to treat coal by pulverising it and mixing it with heavy oil under heat that it becomes in the end a hot fluid. Hydrogen made from hydro-carbon gases and steam is compressed and forced into the converter containing the liquid coal; a reaction between the hydrogen and the coal takes place with the result that the oxygen, nitrogen, and sulphur in the coal are largely removed, and the remaining hydro-carbon matter in the coal liquid combines with the hydrogen to form hydro-carbon oils. The oils are then distilled and a crude light oil is recovered which is refined as motor spirit, while the heavier oil can be used as Diesel oil or further hydrogenated to make a motor spirit. One ton of motor spirit can thus be made from a consumption of 3·15 tons of coal if it is dry and ash-free, and in the Billingham plant it is estimated that they will be able to produce 30,000,000 gallons of motor spirit a year from the consumption of 365,000 tons of coal. We must not expect a very large number of miners therefore to be employed as a result of hydrogenation, but we may expect a big saving to the nation in the future.

The method of hydrogenation is due to Dr. Bergius of Germany, and the first tests in England were carried out by the British Bergius syndicate; others were made by

the British Government at the Fuel Research Station. Subsequently the Imperial Chemicals Industries bought the rights of the syndicate and are now engaged on what may prove to be a revolution in the treatment of coal. Low temperature carbonisation is in its initial stage and has its own advantages. It is still in doubt as to whether this method will be entirely satisfactory from the point of view of cost. The products of low temperature carbonisation are smokeless fuel called coalite, oil, petrol, and a rich gas. Only about 200,000 tons of coal per annum are at present being carbonised by low-temperature methods and up to the present there has been a demand for all the coalite produced at 30s. per ton, but it is very doubtful whether there would be a sufficient demand at this price if some millions of tons of coal were treated in the same fashion. It is possible that the price of the smokeless fuel would then drop by some 10s. a ton. Of course if legislation compelled the use of coalite the whole situation would be altered, but there is no prospect of Parliament taking any such step. The gas produced cannot always be profitably utilised, and one of the problems facing the Low Temperature Carbonisation Co. is the efficient use of the by-products like gas and oil, if these should be produced in much larger quantities. Quite recently it has been suggested that the hydrogenation plant could be profitably employed in connection with low temperature carbonisation for the hydrogenation of the tar oils produced in these plants. To convert tar oils into petrol would cost about 4d. per gallon as compared with 5d. per gallon by the direct conversion of coal to petrol by the Bergius process. The whole question is at an extremely interesting stage, and the next ten years may see a great change in this problem of the right utilisation of our coal supplies. Another development of the near future is the use of coal gas as a motor fuel. Many commercial vehicles have already adopted this method, using the coal gas of the ordinary gas undertakings or the coke ovens. Steel cylinders constructed to withstand very high pressure, into which gas is forced, are at present employed. One great difficulty consists in the construction of cylinders that are light enough and strong enough to withstand a pressure of 300,000 lb. to the square inch. The Birmingham Gas Department has made successful experiments along these lines, and the cost is considerably less per mile than with petrol-driven vehicles.

Up to the present coal gas as a means of propulsion has been used chiefly in the case of omnibuses, but the weight of the cylinders has limited the range of action. One other method of using gas for propulsion purposes is that of generating producer gas by forcing steam and air through coke or charcoal, heated to a high temperature. The gas is generated on the vehicle itself, and it is thought that producer gas may be suitable for light commercial vans although not for the heavier omnibus. The advantage of using this method is that the cost of running is about a quarter that of petrol, and if coke is used as over against charcoal it would, of course, mean the consumption of an additional quantity of coal. Whatever may be its uses for heavier vehicles it is not likely to appeal to the private motorists, and, indeed, in most cases it is much too heavy and bulky for light cars. If, then, the desideratum be an increased use of our coal, with a view to employing more miners on the one hand and making the import of foreign oil less necessary, the State should encourage in every way the economical use of coal for the purposes we have described. It is obvious that if we pay £40,000,000 a year for overseas oil and petrol, and if most of this oil and petrol could be produced in this country, the question which has troubled us for some time past, viz. our decrease in the exports of coal and coke, would not be so serious a matter. It must be remembered that the Government, though it would gain by reason of the additional number of miners employed and also by the addition of a large number who would be engaged in the refining industry, would nevertheless lose an important source of revenue in the tax on motor spirit from abroad. The tax on motor spirit, which is 8d. a gallon, brings in £35,000,000, and although the tax upon heavy oils has been reduced by 1d. a gallon the loss to the Exchequer would have to be taken into account. At the same time the loss is more apparent than real. There are other points to be borne in mind, and one is the possibility that some of the sources of oil supply may in a few years be dried up, and although others will doubtless be discovered there is no absolute certainty that these new sources will provide all that is required. A second point is that in all probability there will be an increasing demand both for motor spirit and for oil, and therefore for some years to come any motor spirit produced in this country would not necessarily displace imported petrol.

There is an increase of these imports every year, and for that reason if for no other it might be well to encourage production and forgo at least a portion of the tax on imported oil. There is little doubt that if the exchange of goods and service between different countries were more or less equivalent we could then export our coal and import our oil ; but while we have large reserves of coal we cannot obtain a sufficient supply of oil from within the Empire, since we only import from the Dominions about two per cent. of the petroleum produced throughout the world.

There is no doubt that our exports of coal are decreasing and are likely still further to decrease, and the only solution is therefore to find some uses for coal in the home market, and the direction in which such a use can be found is clearly in the production of motor spirit and oils. If we take the example of the Works at Billingham, which the Imperial Chemicals Industries are now constructing, we see that although the Exchequer may lose in taxation by its preference of 4d. a gallon something like £500,000 a year, it will be directly and indirectly employing some thousands of men and therefore saving unemployed benefit, and will also increase the purchasing power of these men in such a way as to offset the loss on the Exchequer. There are many other matters that ought to be taken into consideration, such as the employment of British oil tankers and the investment of British money in oil fields ; but although it is difficult to prophesy the future, it is not likely that there would be any real loss to the country, and in the end there would doubtless be a very considerable gain. An argument which is often used in favour of the production of our own oil and petrol is that employed by those who are concerned for the defence of the country. They are using oil for the fighting Services on an immense scale, and one reason for the building of fast cruisers is the necessity for protecting our supplies not only of food but also of oil. The defence forces would therefore be in favour of the production of our own supplies if it can be shown that this was not accompanied by too great a loss. The Navy has adopted oil burning as being more efficient than coal burning, and no sudden reversion to former practice is at all possible. We must therefore take it for granted that in our lifetime we shall never go back to coal, but shall employ oil whether manufactured at home or imported from abroad.

PERCY ALDEN.

DEMOCRACY OR DICTATORSHIP ?*

DURING the past century the dominant movement in British history has been the trend towards democracy. By some great men, such as Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Sir Henry Maine, and Mr. Justice Stephen, this movement has been deplored : they have seen in self-government the negation of good government. By the majority of political thinkers, however, the movement has been welcomed and applauded ; in particular, the philosophical radicals from Jeremy Bentham to John Morley have regarded the merits of democracy as immeasurably outnumbering and outweighing its defects. But neither lamentation nor laudation has seemed to have had the slightest effect upon the ceaseless if slow advance of the people to power. It has resembled the irresistible movement of a glacier, or the overwhelming rise of a river in spate. The stages of its progress have been marked by five great Reform Acts : the first, and in principle the most important, namely the Act of 1832, extended the franchise from the upper middle class to the lower, that is to the farmers in the counties and the *petite bourgeoisie* in the towns ; the Act of 1867 enfranchised the urban artisans ; the Act of 1884 conferred the vote upon the agricultural labourer ; the Act of 1918 opened the electoral roll to Victorian matrons and spinsters, while the concluding and conclusive Act of 1928 let in the flood of Edwardian "flappers." Unless infants and imbeciles can assert and establish their right to share in the government of their country, British democracy can hardly advance further in the political sphere.

Some time, however, before British democracy attained to its present formal completeness, an antagonistic tendency had begun to display itself. For the larger the electorate the more difficult had it become to get it to make up its mind or to do anything. Hence social reformers filled with eager zeal, political idealists in passionate desire to realise their dreams, religious enthusiasts burning with missionary ardour, all sorts of revolutionaries in a hurry, had become disillusioned and disgusted with democracy, and had begun to make experiments in methods of more rapid and more direct action. For

* The substance of an Address delivered to the Summer School at the University College, Southampton, on August 2nd, 1934.

example, in industrial concerns the weapon of the strike had begun to supersede the democratic method of discussion and agreement: the years 1906-14 were pre-eminently the period of belligerent syndicalism. Similarly, women in their demand for votes had begun to abandon argument for violence, and by means of incendiarism, window-breaking, fisticuffing, and horse-whipping—methods which were the very negation and destruction of the democracy that they sought to share—had commenced to carry on their assault upon the constitution. Again, in Ireland, Nationalists in the south and Orangemen in the north had begun to arm and drill in view of a probable civil war. In short, the movement towards dictatorship had set in. If it be asked why I regard these experiments in direct action as essentially dictatorial in character, I would reply by comparing as briefly as possible the fundamental features of the two forms of government—democracy and dictatorship.

The most famous of all definitions of democracy is that of President Lincoln: according to him it is "government of the people, for the people, by the people." This famous definition, as I have elsewhere had occasion to show,* is open to criticism; but, in spite of its defects, it serves to bring out the cardinal fact that the essence of democracy is the sovereignty of the community-as-a-whole, the supremacy of public opinion, the dominance of the communal conscience, the ascendancy of the general will. Democracy stands for the reign of reason in politics, as against the tyranny of brute force. Its method is discussion, argument, debate. Hence it necessarily involves freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of public meeting, freedom of the press.

Dictatorship is the negation of democracy. It is the form of government best connoted by the Greek term "tyranny," that is to say the irresponsible rule of one man. It stands for the dominance of force in politics, as against reason. Its method is violence. It involves the suppression of liberty—the prohibition of freedom of speech, the censorship of the press, the abolition of the right of public meeting, the silencing of criticism, the crushing of opposition, and even (it would appear) the murder of possible antagonists. That dictatorship of some sort may in certain emergencies be necessary, few would venture to deny. The term "dictator" comes to us from Rome, and the Roman republican constitution provided

* *Democracy at the Crossways* (1918), p. 12.

that on occasions of grave public peril all power should, for a strictly limited period and for a clearly defined purpose, be placed in the hands of a single irresponsible ruler. The reason why in such cases of sudden and extreme urgency dictatorship is preferred to any other form of administration is that the single unfettered will of the individual can operate with far greater promptitude, decisiveness and efficiency than the composite and corporate will of any body of debaters.

But if dictatorship has the virtue of necessity in cases of urgent public danger, and for short periods of time, as a permanent system of government it has disadvantages of the gravest kind. To establish it as a normal type of administration is (as Burke might have said) to convert the medicine of the constitution into its staple diet. To deprive the citizen of all share in the government of his country is to degrade the standard of citizenship, and to create a passive and servile type of humanity. The suppression of freedom in the spheres of politics and religion necessarily involves the destruction of independent thinking in science and philosophy. Already has Germany lost the leadership which she once possessed in the realms of the mind. The Nazi terror hangs like a blight over the whole intellectual horizon. Further, if dictatorship has the merit of promptitude and efficiency, if it is free from the slowness, the vacillation, the hesitation, the incompetence of an executive dependent upon a popular vote, it has the defect that it is out of touch with public opinion. It cannot tell when it is outraging the conscience of the community, when it is offending national prejudice, when it is defying the general will. Hence it is liable to go on sinking deeper and deeper into disfavour until at last it is engulfed in an abyss of loathing and disgust. For if it is a merit of democracy to provide an alternative government, it is a grave defect of dictatorship not to do so. There is under a dictatorship no organised opposition ready to assume the responsibility of office. Bolshevism in Russia, Fascism in Italy, National Socialism in Germany, stand supreme and solitary. All rival parties are extinguished. No change of administration can be effected except by violent revolution, and to obviate the ever-present peril of such a revolution, dictatorship does not shrink from the extremest measures of espionage and terrorism. The life of suspects is made a hell from which death is a welcome (and usually speedy) release. There is, moreover, no sort of guarantee that

protracted dictatorships will retain their pristine purity and efficiency. The dictator may (like Pilsudski in Poland) grow old and lethargic, or he may (like Lenin in Russia) break down in health under the strain of omnipotence, or he may (like Hitler in Germany) find that he has undertaken a task wholly beyond his powers. From one cause or another, dictatorship, if prolonged, is almost bound to collapse of its own inherent weakness. And then the last state of the nation over which it has exercised sway is probably much worse than it was under the domain of the discarded democracy. A decadent dictatorship is, indeed, the limit of badness in government.

If, then, we compare dictatorship with democracy, we may say succinctly that while democracy stands for the force of argument, dictatorship stands for the argument of force; that the appeal of democracy is to reason, but the appeal of dictatorship is to irrational violence; that democracy is based on freedom, but dictatorship on subjection; that democracy counts heads, while dictatorship breaks them. The one valid excuse for dictatorship, indeed, is that, in circumstances of extreme emergency and for a short period, it provides what, under those conditions, is a good government. It may, I think, be freely admitted that Italy under Mussolini's rule has enjoyed a distinctly more efficient régime than that of the corrupt and incompetent democracy which it superseded. The ideal of democracy is rather self-government than good government. Mr. Bernard Shaw, if I remember rightly, somewhere says in effect that democracy is a device by means of which a people can assure itself of being governed as badly as it wants to be. Abraham Lincoln, the greatest exponent of nineteenth-century democracy, explicitly asserted that "self-government is better than good government." There is, of course, no necessary antithesis between the two. Probably, indeed, in the long run good government and self-government are identical. But in our present imperfect world, with its vast uneducated electorates and its crowds of imperfect politicians, self-government is often far removed from good government. Every extension of the franchise in Great Britain since 1832 has resulted in a degradation of parliament and a weakening of the executive. The introduction of democracy into India has meant a distinct deterioration in the administration, and its further extension under the White Paper scheme will inevitably result, at any rate for a time, in

enfeeblement and demoralisation. Democracy in India will, indeed, almost certainly doom millions to death. The cost of freedom and autonomy is not infrequently a very high one. Nevertheless, if self-government is better than good government the price may have to be paid. Professor A. N. Whitehead assures us that "the essence of human civilisation lies in the substitution of persuasion for force." The way of democracy, then, is the way of progress, and it must be pursued even though it leads through regions of mortal peril. The way of dictatorship is the way of retrogression. It marks a return to barbarism.

In Great Britain the tendency towards dictatorship was immensely aggravated by the great war of 1914-18. For, as Mr. Herbert Spencer long ago pointed out, a belligerent community is almost necessarily authoritarian and autocratic. An army cannot be successfully commanded by a debating society, and a state at war needs to be governed by a unitary and swiftly operating will. Hence, although the war was fought on the part of the anti-German allies "to make the world safe for democracy," it was inevitably waged by increasingly anti-democratic methods. And democracy has never fully recovered from the injuries which it received during the four years of its supersession. Moreover, the return of peace did not suffice to rehabilitate it. For the years from 1918 onward were a period of appalling strain and stress, marked by exasperating realignments of frontiers, painful migrations of populations, difficult disbandings of gigantic armies, widespread disorganisations of industry, oppressive taxations, incalculable fluctuations of currencies, poverty, disillusionment, disgust. Amid the universal disappointment and unrest democracy was scarcely able to recover itself even in its ancient homes such as France and England, while its attempts to establish itself in new homes, such as Russia and Germany, were spectacular failures.

First in Russia (1917) came the overthrow of the transient and embarrassed democracy of Kerensky, and the establishment of the Bolshevik dictatorship of Lenin. Then in Italy (1922) followed the blow by means of which Mussolini and the Fascists displaced the corrupt and incompetent ministry of Facta. Next ensued the revolution in Turkey (1925), whereby Mustapha Kemal abolished the old Mohammedan régime and initiated his amazing revival of the secularised Ottoman State.

In the succeeding year (1926) occurred the somewhat similar national resurrection of Poland under the victorious Marshal Pilsudski, whose dictatorial administration swept away the divided and ineffective government of Witos and Wojciechowski. In 1929 was established the royal dictatorship of Alexander of Jugo-Slavia, rendered necessary by the irreconcilable feuds and sanguinary furies of Serbians and Croats. Then, finally, in 1933 came the strokes whereby Hitler superseded the Weimar constitution in Germany, and the heroic but ill-fated Dollfuss in Austria ended the envenomed triangular duel between Nationalists, Fascists, and Communists. And beside these seven major dictatorships we have to note the establishment of partial or temporary dictatorships in Spain, Greece, Lithuania, and Bulgaria. It would seem as though autocracy were sweeping the Western world.

What remains to democracy? In many of the smaller states it continues to flourish and to function quietly yet efficiently. Among these may be mentioned Holland and Belgium, the Scandinavian kingdoms, Switzerland, and various Baltic, Balkan, and American republics. But among the major states three have to bear the burden of its maintenance, namely the United States of America, France, and Great Britain. And in each of these three, tendencies towards dictatorship are manifest.

1. In the United States a tremendous financial crisis in 1933 brought President Roosevelt into power. He at once established what at first sight looks like a dictatorship. Nevertheless, such it is not. It differs *toto caelo* from the tyrannies of Lenin, Mussolini, or Hitler; it more closely resembles the constitutional dictatorships of antique Rome. For, to begin with, it was established by Congress: President Roosevelt exercises powers that have been duly delegated, not powers that have been violently seized. Then again, the president's powers, vast as they are, are limited and checked by all sorts of constitutional safeguards. The electorate is still active and expectant, waiting for its chance to confirm or condemn the presidential novelties. The press is still free; public meetings are open; organised labour and combined capital flourish with undiminished possibilities.

2. In France, too, it survives, although it is menaced by external foes and by internal corruption. On the one hand,

it is threatened by two distinctly dictatorial movements. From the right, the monarchists, whether Bonapartist or Orleanist, watch for the opportunity of a *coup d'état*. From the left, the Jacobins, whether communist or syndicalist, look for an occasion of effective revolution. On the other hand, and more seriously, French democracy is endangered by its own corruption and weakness. There are too many parties in France, and they are divided from one another by animosities too intense and by differences of principle too profound. All ministries are necessarily coalition ministries, for no one party can ever secure a clear majority. And all the kaleidoscopic coalition ministries are feeble and ephemeral. Brief and insecure tenure of office lessens the sense of ministerial responsibility, and deprives the ministers of any effective incentive to make themselves efficient. Hence incompetence tends to prevail, and moral scandals to arise. These administrative defects are gravely aggravated by excessive taxation, by currency fluctuation, and by a growing lack of employment for the restless and disgruntled *intelligentsia*.

3. Great Britain, too, is passing through her period of storm and stress. Parliament is under a cloud : it seems to have lost the prestige which it carried without question in Victorian days. Faced by problems of appalling magnitude—problems international, imperial, social, economic, military, ecclesiastical—it appears to be incapable of making up its mind or of doing anything decisive. It tends to drift, in the evident hope that problems will solve themselves, or that something will turn up. Hence it is flanked on both sides by parties of action, each committed to policies of violent innovation, and both as hostile to one another as they are contemptuous of parliament.

On the one side are the Fascists, imitators of Mussolini and Hitler. There are three separate and mutually hostile groups of them in Britain. First, there are the so-called British Fascists (founded in 1923), who are frankly and simply anti-democratic and anti-semitic. Secondly, there is the Imperial Fascist League (1928), formed to oppose Socialism and Little-Englandism. Both these bodies are merely negative and almost negligible. The third body is more important. It is the British Union of Fascists, established in 1932 by the chameleon-like Sir Oswald Mosley. It has a more comprehensive and more positive programme. Like its rivals, it is anti-democratic, anti-semitic, anti-socialistic, and anti-

cosmopolitan. But it also has, as a positive policy, the founding of the corporative state on the Italian model. And it is prepared to carry out its policy by means of the doses of castor oil and the other dictatorial devices which proved effective in Cisalpine Gaul twelve years ago.

The Fascists on the right are counterbalanced by the members of the new Socialist League on the left. Sir Stafford Cripps and his fellows tell us quite frankly what they mean to do. They intend, by unmitigated denunciation of the National Government and by lavish promises of "social reform," to secure a parliamentary majority, and then they propose by means of an emergency bill, forced through parliament in a single day, to get parliament to commit suicide and transfer its powers to a collective dictatorship which will at once carry through the social revolution. If the House of Lords obstructs, it will be swamped by proletarian peers. If the King declines to create the necessary pack he will himself be put upon the retired list. If the judges boggle at the enforcement of the new spoliation, they will be superseded by special administrative officials of the true red type. If the menaced capitalists show signs of resistance they will be ruthlessly crushed. In short, while Sir Oswald Mosley models himself upon Mussolini, Sir Stafford Cripps takes Lenin as his leader and guide.

There are some who profess to laugh at these threats of dictatorship in Britain. Mr. Ramsbotham, Parliamentary Secretary of the Board of Education, for instance, maintains that they may be treated as "at the best a good joke and at the worst as a bad one." He thinks that *Punch* or *Pour Rire* is an adequate prophylactic. "Nothing kills like ridicule," he remarks, "and a French or English caricaturist could quickly put an end to a would-be autocrat." I wish I were as confident as Mr. Ramsbotham. If it were to come to killing quickly, I should back a revolver against ridicule. In all probability before the caricaturist had concocted his destructive cartoon the would-be autocrat would have suppressed his paper and in some way have extinguished him himself.

No: the price of liberty is eternal vigilance, and if Great Britain is not to lose its heritage of democratic self-government it must resolutely resist all temptations to take dictatorial short cuts, even though they are said to lead directly to a people's paradise.

F. J. C. HEARNshaw.

WHAT ARE THE MINIMUM RIGHTS OF HUMANS?

THE ideas of most of the people with whom I have talked about this fundamentally important question are almost as hazy, or as narrow, as their ideas about politics, health, and a number of other vital subjects ! Here are two typical examples of what these people have said : " I think it's a shame to prohibit the sale of certain things at certain hours, and to close cinemas at certain times. This is D.O.R.A., curtailing our rights as citizens." Needless to say, the " certain things " included alcoholic drinks, and forms of betting and gambling. " Well, I should say that all humans have a right to food, clothing, shelter, and safety." I scarcely ever find anyone who has given the matter thorough and open-minded thought.

And yet among the striking features of recent legislation have been these two : the extension of more rights (the vote, " education," free speech, and so on) to more individuals ; and the curtailing of other rights for the majority. One might have imagined that an intelligent public would have asked itself what the essential Rights of Humans really are.

The Lord's Prayer contains a request that we shall have to-day the *artos* that is *epiousios*. The 1611 rendering, " daily bread," is agreed by scholars to be inaccurate. I find that most of the authorities are in favour of the view that *epiousios* meant " for the coming day." And it is obvious that *artos* represented not merely " bread," but " food " ; it is surely legitimate to extend the word still further, and to make it cover the rights of humans. Anyhow, it is interesting that, if we assume *epiousios* to refer to the immediate future, there is an aspect of rights that is often forgotten : namely, that they must be of a prospective nature—they must bring into account not only the present but the coming needs.

The minimum Rights of Humans must take into consideration some provision for the day or days ahead. And one thinks immediately of the handicap that there is when workers, though they may have enough food, etc., for the moment, do not feel confident that their supply will be certain directly. An essential feature of a right is its extension beyond to-day. And surely the feeling of security of necessities beyond the moment does help good work, in contrast to the

feeling that the rights are ephemeral, as who should say, "Why should I toil with a view to the future if my reward may cease almost at once?"

But to go back to the list of rights!

The orthodox list mentions the above-named rights—food, clothing, and shelter; it adds warmth, safety of life and property, education. And it is generally taken for granted that such rights should be given freely by the Government, or by the Home or other Institution, at least to children and others who are not in a position to get such things for themselves.

I find that nearly all these words are used in rather a vague way. A clearer definition is obviously needed. Thus food may be ample in bulk, but not conducive to health and efficiency. Food should be not only sufficient in general quantity, but also, however little it may cost, on the one hand pure and good and well prepared, on the other hand well-balanced as regards the different food-factors—the body-building, energy-giving, and so forth. Drink is usually ignored, unless it is to be included under the heading of food! It is only just beginning to be realised by the millions that water is valuable for many reasons.

Again, when food is mentioned, there is little or no mention of the negatives. There is an occasional warning against excess of alcoholic drinks or strong tea; but there is scarcely any recognition of the fact that the good results of otherwise fairly satisfactory meals may be cancelled by the bad results of undesirable additions: as when, in the slums, children are given gin and pickles. We can pause for a moment to emphasise an aspect of these rights which is scarcely ever even mentioned: namely, that quite apart from the securing of any other rights, such as education or safety of property, it pays a nation and a home, at compound interest, when the foods and drinks are well-balanced and right and contain the minimum of harmful additions.

"Clothing" needs to be defined as not merely of sound material and clean, but also healthy in its shape. It is sad to think of the filth and discomfort of much of the clothing—especially the underclothing—of the poor. As to "Shelter," this, again, should be clean. It should, besides, be well ventilated and lighted, and have reasonable space. It would abundantly pay the nation to give to numbers of the unem-

ployed, instead of a part of the dole, good food, plenty of water, sound clothing, and shelter. Thousands of the unemployed are unemployed partly because they are badly fed, badly clothed (the ragged or dirtily-clothed applicant for work has a poor chance), and because they and their clothing have suffered from exposure to cold and rain. One must add that a great deal of unfitness is due to the execrable ventilation in many "homes," where the easiest way of getting warmth is to keep the entrances of fresh air, and the exits of foul but hot air, closed.

Little need be said about safety of person and property. This is probably the right which Government neglects least of all. But there should also be a far cheaper provision of justice. Surely, most of the justice should be free to the poor—and, indeed, to every citizen. A great deal has been done in the direction of Employers' Liability. I feel that employers' rights would often be better secured if now and then there was a little more legislation as to employees' liability!

We come now to that vast subject, education. As to what may be called technical or vocational education, I shall say little, except that I am convinced that every citizen has the right to be taught at least the solid and sound foundations of not less than two money-earning occupations. Out of a host of branches or aspects of education, I can select only one or two, and these only for a few notes. The first branch is physical. I cannot conceive of any more absolute right than the right of physical education—especially in a country where the grown-ups have set such a bad example to children. I am amazed to find how many elderly and influential (I had almost said *influenzial*) people appear to be almost utterly neglectful of such elementary items of physical education as at least reasonable mastication and insalivation of foods, correct posture of the body, depth and fulness of breathing, and scrupulous cleanliness of the whole person inside and out. Children have the right not only to be told what is best for their bodies (and minds), but also to have good examples shown them by those whom they naturally respect and imitate.

Another part of true education is what the Greeks called *metanoia*. The word sometimes included "repentance," but in its widest sense it meant "thinking differently." Things are improving to-day, but there is still left a vast handicap to

national efficiency and well-being in the slogan, "Custom and authority are always correct." Surely, if the first general commandment of Jesus (according to our records) was "Think differently," this should be one of the first rights and privileges of humans, even of the young—to have their own views, and to think for themselves. Among many ways in which this right of questioning and of asking questions is important is that it should compel the elderly to open their minds, to think freshly and young-ly, so as to find "a reason for the faith that is in them"—in so far as it has an adequate reason.

Side by side with this freedom of opinion—and, to some extent, of action, so long as it does not injure others—there must be Discipline. Every one has a right to be disciplined in accuracy and neatness, in self-control and self-mastery, as well as to be encouraged in self-expression. An excellent sign of the times is the candour with which the public is urged to attend to its self-sanitation. But, so far as Government is concerned, the public—I am speaking here of the millions—is deprived of the right of free sanitation in the usual sense of the word. It is an utter disgrace to our civilisation that an exorbitant charge is made for the performance of a national duty, a "duty towards one's neighbour"—cleansing of the skin and the bowels. It is not at all an exaggeration to say that millions are actually "fined" for doing what they ought to be fined for not doing. Can any fair-minded person deny that free sanitation—free facilities for washing and excretion—must be not merely a right of every citizen, but also a cheap and remunerative investment for the nation, a leveller of class differences (this aspect of the matter, this exclusiveness of cleansing equipment, is seldom appreciated), and—for, after all, this is the way to get a thing done!—a fine electioneering appeal? Here is an employment for which numbers of the unemployed are pre-eminently suitable.

Let there be, besides, abundant fresh and clean water available throughout the land for drinking—confound the vested interests of public houses and restaurants and tea-places! Let the people be encouraged to be clean inside and out. Let there be an official leaflet about it.

And would it be a terrible thing if the moral and spiritual symbolism were alluded to? Or would it be introducing something "religious" where it was quite "out of place"? Is it not one of our rights, as humans, especially if we profess

to follow the Master, to be told how certain things and acts have a soul and a spirit within their superficial and material "body"?

Another Right of Humans is rest—and facilities for rest. Some churches—thank the Lord and the clergy—are open night and day: St. Martin-in-the-Fields is the best known of these churches. But where can we sit alone, in a warm place in cold weather, under cover in rainy weather? Where can we sit and rest—or think quietly? Where is the "place apart"? Recreation is another Right of Humans; and here we are better off than years ago. Yet what healthy and interesting games are there in cities, outside such institutions as the Y.M.C.A.? "Squash" has become popular among the fairly well-to-do. But why are not some of our empty buildings adapted for (hand-)fives, bat fives (needing only an almost imperishable solid indiarubber ball and a plain piece of wood), and a few other games—not omitting indoor cricket, football, and hockey—available almost free of charge? How we waste our buildings! And our opportunities of making money! A small charge for those who could afford it would make such institutions pay handsomely.

And, by the way, one of the items in our education is to be told how best we can use our leisure. Some "social" life would be given by this means. We all have the right of enjoying home life and social life. And it is not a real right unless it has its obligations as well as its privileges. Every one is entitled to have any genius or *flair* recognised and encouraged. That is a "tall order." But we, as a nation, lose untold millions of money and break hundreds of hearts, by the plan of crushing the unusual and the "unlike." I do not mean, of course, that faults and weaknesses should be condoned. We have the right to get these pointed out and corrected: this is part of the discipline which I included among our rights. But we do need to look out for and appreciate, encourage, and promote originality and talent.

We have a right to general advice and sympathy. Even those who have parents do not always find in them just what they need. There should be hundreds of individuals part of whose work would be like that of the best heads of junior reformatory institutions—to listen and learn and guide in a friendly way. Above all, humans have a right to get work—as healthy, and as helpful to others, and as appropriate to the

individual's penchant as possible ; but—work. And fair remuneration for work.

But the great mass of our rights are our own. We do not need to have them given to us : we possess them already. All we need is to know about them, and to use and develop them. To my mind they outweigh the rights granted us by others. There seems to be a notion that a right is not a real right unless we are given it by others : in fact, some rights are looked upon as necessitating a demand. Our finest rights are in the hands of no one except ourselves. Yet we have the right to know—to be told authoritatively, as an integral part of our education—that these rights are *our* rights. And our obligations. Every one of them is an obligation, a duty.

We have a right to words. We can refuse to use some : we can insist on using others, even if we only use them silently. The effect of saying—simply saying—quietly to ourselves such words as Power, Peace, Prosperity, Plenty, Patience, Purity, Progress, is great. What is there to prevent us ? We can control our posture and expression—or, rather, our many expressions : our gestures, our tone of voice, our eyes, our mouth. This is our right and obligation. We have the right to our thoughts, especially about others ; to our wishes and aspirations ; to our prayers ; to our theories of life ; to our faith in the Father ; to our imaginations, of success, or lovely scenery, of inventions, of kindnesses.

We have the right of seeing the funny, whimsical side of persons and things, instead of the grim worrying side : we can keep the humorous aspect to ourselves. We have that right, too. To music—we can sing any song or tune we like, noiselessly if we are afraid to sing out loud ! We can draw ; there is plenty of paper everywhere, and burnt matches ! We can write : what a privilege ! How little we use this power in the best directions ! We can read ; old daily papers and other papers can be had for the asking. The news may be ephemeral—thank the Lord, it often is ; but the excellent general articles are for days beyond the day of publication.

We have the right to breathe really fully, and to exhale well, and to do numbers of other exercises. We have the right to stretch, and so counteract some of the bad effects of so much sitting and leaning forwards. We have the right to relax our muscles, and so ease our nerves and our minds. We have the right to rest more often than we do, and to have little spells

and pauses : for instance, to close our eyes now and then.

We have the right to our own memories of pleasant and helpful things. We have the right to observe, to reason, to work out analogies, to realise that we must be worth while, or else we should not be here now !

It seems to me absurd that political economy, which I used to study in the text-books of past decades, does not set out the rights of humans as at the very foundation of its ideas. For what could be more political? What could be more economical? If the nation, instead of lavishing millions of pounds on so many loans to foreign countries, so many commissions of enquiry, so many military and other expenses, were to invest a small sum in giving every citizen at least some of these rights, I am firmly convinced that the money would come back in a very short time in health—and the saving of hundreds of millions of pounds now lost through avoidable ill-health ; in happiness, which helps the whole of life, including its finance ; in efficiency in every department.

From another point of view, are we truly civilised if we fail to give these rights to all—or at least the majority of them to the majority of people? For the inevitable objection to my suggestions will be that it would be utterly impossible to grant even half these rights even to half the people ! Very well, then : let us do something. Let us provide more water in more places ; more sanitation in more places ; more healthy meals at a little over cost price in more places ; more real health-education in more places ; more work in more places ! If we do not do something considerable, and do it quickly, I fail to see how we can compete with our national rivals. The workhouse, the dole, “ charity,” individual efforts—these are not the solution of the problem.

Let us, as a nation, face the question, “ What are the minimum Rights of Humans ? ” And then, having discussed the matter without prejudice, let us decide what we *can* do—even if it means appointing a commission ! For, strange though it may seem, there have been times when a commission has decided promptly, and has carried good measures through. We are not treating humans as humans should treat humans. And, until we do, we cannot deserve national success, although we may get large orders for machinery and military paraphernalia from abroad, and build the biggest steamer in the world.

EUSTACE MILES.

TEN YEARS OF SUGAR-BEET.

THE total amount of State assistance to the sugar-beet industry since 1924 has amounted to over £39,000,000.

The original scheme was designed for the ten crop years, 1924-25 to 1933-34, and the policy was then to come up for review. The subsidy period has since been extended to cover the year 1934-35, and a committee has been appointed to inquire into the results of this heavy expenditure.

The history of the industry in this country is interesting. In spite of the stimulus of high sugar prices during the war and a complete remission in 1922 of excise duties on home-grown sugar, giving a preference of 25s. 8d. per cwt. against foreign sugar and 21s. 5d. against Empire sugar, the acreage of sugar-beet was only 16,000 acres in 1923, and the existing two factories were losing money. When the Finance Act of 1924 reduced this considerable aid by lowering the sugar duty to 11s. 8d., it was decided to provide a subsidy for the industry, at the same time reimposing the excise duty, though maintaining a preference over foreign sugar. The British Sugar (Subsidy) Act, passed in March 1925, granted a subsidy of 19s. 6d. per cwt. of home-grown sugar for the first four years, including the 1924-25 season, 13s. for the next three years and 6s. 6d. for the remaining three years. During the first ten years, the subsidy totalled £27,189,000 and the revenue rebate a further £9,649,000. Under this stimulus the industry developed rapidly and by 1930, a peak year, the number of growers had increased from 4,000 in 1924 to 40,000, and the number of factories from 3 to 17; sugar production rose from 24,000 tons to 424,000 tons; and the number of factory workers increased from about 3,000 to 9,900.

The reasons given for the granting of the subsidy were threefold: to relieve agriculture and maintain the arable area; to increase employment, both urban and rural; and to establish a new industry. The time has now come to balance the achievements of the subsidy against the probable expenditure of over £40,000,000. The assets must be gauged by the extent to which the subsidy has achieved the above objectives.

The primary purpose of the subsidy was the relief of agriculture from the severe depression which followed the drop in prices between 1921 and 1924; but only a portion of the subsidy has reached the farmer. As early as 1926 Mr.

Runciman warned the House of Commons that "the main portion of the profit which accrues from the scheme goes to those who own and finance the factories and not to the farmers." In the first seven years about one-half was retained by the factories; in later years a larger share went to the farmer, but it is open to question whether such a method of distribution can be justified. So far as the factories are concerned, their returns during the ten years have not been disappointing to the shareholders. Dividends have, in general, been maintained above the 5 per cent. level.

Even that part of the subsidy which did eventually reach the farmer afforded only very localised relief; it is not a national measure. About two-thirds of the beet acreage is found in Norfolk, Suffolk, Lincolnshire and the Isle of Ely, and it is probable that over 70 per cent. of the farmers' share of the subsidy went to these four counties. It is claimed in extenuation of this distribution that these areas were mainly arable and the most depressed. That may be true, but a large part of the subsidy has gone to the less needy parts of these counties. The growing of beet is concentrated on the better classes of soil. One of the Cambridge University reports cites an area of 250,000 acres of Huntingdon and West Cambridge, with 60 per cent. of the land under the plough and within easy reach of beet factories, described elsewhere as "one of the most depressed, if not the most depressed, district in the Eastern Counties," in which only 0·8 per cent. of the farm area was under beet in 1932. A similar situation is found over 200,000 acres of boulder clay in N.W. Essex and S.W. Suffolk. The chalk and limestone belt was another of the hardest hit areas, yet in the five counties containing it, only 1,701 acres out of 725,177 were under beet in 1932. Allowing for the factories' share and for these four beet-growing counties, little more than one-sixth of the total subsidy can have been left for the remaining forty-eight counties of England and Wales and for Scotland.

The area of arable land in Great Britain has not been maintained; it fell by over two million acres in the ten years, 1923-32. The 400,000 acres of beet are, of course, not a net gain, since the beet displaced other crops. It may have helped to prevent land going out of cultivation, but this is unlikely since beet growing is in general found on the better farming land which is the last to go down. By not helping

the marginal land the beet subsidy may have even emphasised the decline in arable land. During the three pre-subsidy years the arable area in the four beet-growing counties declined at the rate of 0·68 per cent. per year, and in the rest of England at the rate of 2·38 per cent. In the first seven years of the subsidy the rate of decline in the beet counties was almost the same, 0·69 per cent., but it had slowed down to 1·99 per cent. in the non-beet counties.

It is difficult to estimate the effect of the subsidy as a means of creating employment, either on the farm or in the factory. About two-thirds of the crops displaced by sugar-beet, such as turnips, swedes, mangolds and potatoes, had high labour requirements, both regular and seasonal, so that the net gain is confined to the areas where beet has displaced grain crops. In Norfolk and Suffolk there was an increase in regular farm workers during the first three years of the subsidy, but there followed a decline and regular employment was, in 1932, less than in 1924. Farmers state that the subsidy has enabled them to keep on regular workers and give longer employment to casual workers, but it will always be open to doubt whether a similar or stronger claim could not have been made if fodder roots and cattle feeding had been subsidised. So far as factory employment is concerned, the results have not come up to expectation. Lord Moyne stated, when the subsidy was mooted, that every hundred acres of beet would give factory employment for ten men. At that rate the 1930 acreage should have given work to about 35,000 workers, yet the official report stated that the number was only 9,900. Moreover, it must be remembered that for almost four out of every five of the workers, the employment created is limited to 60-114 days in the year.

Has the industry established itself after the generous assistance of the past ten years, and can it continue without a liberal measure of state assistance? Factory income and expenditure are such that, if the subsidy were to disappear, though maintaining the present revenue rebate, the price for beet might fall to 27s.-28s. per ton. Judging by existing costs of production, it is safe to assert that the beet acreage would be reduced to less than half the present area if there were no marked drop in farm costs or increase in factory costs.

Costs might be lowered if yields were increased; but the most disturbing feature of the British industry during ten

years of subsidy has been its low yield of beet and the very slight increase in the output of sugar per acre. When the subsidy started a yield of about 12-13 tons of beet per acre was counted upon ; it has averaged just under 8. Apart from seasonal fluctuations, the yield of beet per acre has remained practically unchanged since 1924. Considering the continuous efforts made by factories, advisory centres, research stations and other bodies to increase the output, the result is disappointing. Germany and Czechoslovakia, the main continental beet countries, obtain about 3,700 lb. of sugar to the acre ; the British yield is 2,493 lb. The yields from sugar cane are on a still higher level and are increasing rapidly as the result of improved breeding and extracting. Bridges and Dixey stated in 1928 that it remains open to doubt whether the yields in this country can ever reach the same level as do foreign yields.

It may well be questioned whether sugar-beet can ever compete with cane sugar without artificial stimulus. Foreign countries have striven for longer than ten years to put the industry on its feet. The United States is now paying over £44 million a year, Germany £24 million, France £15 million, and Italy £5 million, with similar lack of success. There seems to be no end to the liabilities incurred in attempting to establish sugar-beet growing.

The sugar-beet subsidy was originally definitely planned as a short-time temporary measure ; it was limited to ten years and provided for the progressive scaling-down of the subsidy. Temporary aid is usually justified on two grounds, to establish a new industry or to tide an industry of national importance over a temporary depression or crisis arising from markedly abnormal causes. No one, not even the most fervent defender of the sugar-beet subsidy, can hold that the expenditure of almost £40 million has *established*, on an economic basis, a new industry in the country, a fact emphasised by the clamour raised for the continuation of special state assistance.

Temporary relief from abnormal factors should fulfil three conditions. It should not aggravate the causes of the depression, otherwise it will be intensified and lengthened. It should not stimulate false developments and establish lines of production which are grossly uneconomic and which can never " stand on their own legs " in normal times ; vested

interests, once established, become deeply rooted and difficult to eradicate. It should not retard the invention and application of new methods to suit changing conditions. Can it be claimed that the sugar-beet subsidy meets these requirements? It has intensified the drop in sugar prices ; just as the subsidy started, over-production of sugar was becoming evident ; the International Sugar Council has estimated that normal sugar stocks in the countries which are members of the International Sugar Plan, should be 1,003,000 short tons, but the actual carry-over is now over 7,500,000. Throughout this period of increasing supplies the British subsidy has artificially stimulated production ; during a depression resulting in part from a severe restriction in international trade, the subsidy has reduced it still further.

An industry has been started which gives little or no hope of ever being able to compete either with continental sugar-beet or with cane sugar without continued financial assistance ; it has created vested interests which will prove difficult, if not impossible, to placate without considerable further burden either to the taxpayer or the consumer. The beet crop has undoubtedly valuable qualities ; it is a crop with a high labour requirement ; it provides an immediate cash income ; it gives useful by-products for stock-feeding ; and it requires little capital outlay on the part of the farmer. But it has failed to fulfil the conditions which were to justify its existence. The money would have been better spent in assisting an established branch of British farming which had proved itself capable of carrying on in normal times.

If it is decided to continue the subsidy in some form or other, it must be considered as a method of granting permanent assistance to farming, since it has none of the qualifications of a temporary measure. The aid will be restricted to the present factory areas, and to the better class lands in these districts ; it must always remain a very local relief measure (incidentally, it is to almost the same areas that the other direct financial aid, the Wheat Subsidy, penetrates). Before such a decision is made, there should be a frank examination of the results of this ten years' experiment of alternative methods of granting assistance, or even of the possibility of cutting the annual losses which will be incurred by its continuation.

KEITH A. H. MURRAY.

SELF-EXPRESSION, SELF-REPRESSION, SELF-REALISATION.

ONE of the most universally adopted and most skilfully advocated cults of the moment is undoubtedly that called Self-Expression ; and it is equally undeniable that this satisfies an ever-clamant human need, and sustains an invaluable principle of human experience. This is because self-expression meets that demand for freedom, for individuality or even creativeness, which springs from the rebellion against becoming enslaved by either society, custom or tradition, and which has the supreme merit of insisting that no one should be a mere copy of others' ideals, no matter how fine these in themselves may be. In the same spirit it emphasises the truth that the very essence of human nature is to be dynamic, to be not only a conduit, but still more a source, of psychic energy that is unique both in its character and its products. This is often stated in negative terms : man is never a passive instrument or channel of life and consciousness, in the same way that the animal world transmits these attributes from generation to generation. To this it may be retorted that man himself is no more than an animal of superior type. This is certainly more accurate than the witty description of mankind as an anthropoid species afflicted with megalomania. Nevertheless, however closely we may trace the common origins of man and his animal kin, as well as their biological continuity, we can never permit these features to obscure that "enormous expansion of the powers of discrimination based upon acquired knowledge," which forms "the fundamental distinction" so profoundly differentiating even the most primitive peoples from all the rest of Nature.* Far more incomparable and incalculable, then, must be the genius of artist and scientist, of mystic and saint ; so that if man be an animal, he is none the less an organism that has unquestionably attained a status wholly unparalleled, which empowers him, and him alone of terrestrial beings, "from Non-Being to bring forth into Being."†

It follows, therefore, that the more urgently self-expression stresses individuality and creativeness, the more inadequate

* Prof. Elliot Smith, *The Evolution of Man*, p. 63.

† Prof. N. Hartmann, *Ethics*, Vol. I, p. 243.

and illogical must any classification of man as nothing more than an animal become. It is almost as if, in an excess of purely logical zeal, we were to include metals and non-metals, or elements and compounds, in one undistinguished group. But surely, when we pay due regard to the unceasing triumphs of thought, the innumerable achievements of æsthetic feeling and emotion, the keenness of the moral sense and the insuppressible yearnings of religion, and when we realise that "even the highest animals have only the barest rudiments of such possibilities,"* the outstanding contrasts between animality and humanity must far outweigh their resemblances, many and significant though these admittedly are.

Doubtless the unrestricted manifestation of self-expression is simply the inevitable reaction from the exaggerated repression of earlier days. Nevertheless it is a fatal misconception of the facts to suppose that release from repression is identical with the abandonment of all control. For it is Freud himself—the psychologist whom Professor McDougall has compared to Aristotle, and who has most clearly revealed the evils of repression—who insists on two equally cardinal principles: first, that human nature always needs effective guidance, and secondly that this can originate from only one source—that is from the dynamic function of Reason. "We have no other means," Freud contends, "of controlling our instincts than our intelligence. The human intellect is weak in comparison with instincts. The voice of the intellect is a soft one, but it does not rest till it has gained a hearing. Ultimately, after endlessly repeated rebuffs, it succeeds."† In the case of any other writer this might be called nothing more than abstract intellectualism; but Freud's consistent emphasis on the unconscious and the superconscious, on the emotions and their allied non-rational factors of experience, absolutely immunises him against any such criticism. For Reason, it must be repeated, is essentially a "dynamic function," best exhibited in such familiar pleas as "Be reasonable," "Take a reasonable view," "Think the matter over," that must so often be addressed to impetuous and impulsive people. Reason in its true and proper sense, that is to say, is never the mere abstract content of some textbook

* Dr. Julian Huxley, *What Dare I Think?*, p. 151.

† *The Future of an Illusion*, pp. 83, 93.

on Formal Logic. This is simply the skeleton of Reason ; and while a skeleton is certainly indispensable, it is never sufficient. And the commonplace phrases just cited are only the popular versions of the fundamental and universally accepted principle which compels a judge or jury categorically to reject an unreasonable legal contention, a scientist to exclude unreasonable theories and a statesman an unreasonable policy—attitudes that are instinctively adopted on all such occasions. In every instance of this kind the charge of unreasonableness, or what is exactly the same defect in the more formal terms of irrationality or illogicality, is fatal. Of course this does not imply that man always acts and argues rationally, nor that when he does so he discovers and applies a perfectly logical and irrefutable principle. On the contrary, as no psychologist has more clearly shown than Freud himself, Reason must submit to “endlessly repeated rebuffs.” The essential and remarkable point is that, in spite of these, “it succeeds” ; which means that no normal and sane person ever embarks on any course which he clearly sees to be unreasonable, not even if this will yield some nefarious or immoral advantages ; for he himself at least judges his plans to be, under the given conditions, the most reasonable means to whatever end he has in view. Similarly, the wisest of us make serious mistakes ; but these can be avoided or remedied only by finding sounder—that is, once again, less irrational—principles of action than those hitherto employed ; while even the most generous and noble impulses demand their justification on some grounds of Reason. Not even art can furnish any proper exception, since, as Ernest Newman has cogently maintained, both Beethoven and Wagner expressed a “marvellous and far-reaching logic” :* in other words, an æsthetic logic that is actually the richest artistic fulfilment of the Formal Logic of the textbooks.

In fact, it is precisely in the vast realm of art, so far as this is imperishable and immortal, that the indestructible intimacy between expression and control is best perceived. For every artist, needless to say, expresses himself even while at the same moment he expresses far more than himself. Now artistic self-expression is never merely capricious, no matter how skilfully it may simulate caprice in many of art's finest

* *The Unconscious Beethoven*, pp. 120, 148 ; *Wagner*, p. 221.

achievements. It is obvious that æsthetic formality, and still more absolute outline, lucidity or bareness, can be attained only by rigid control of material and method ; while profusion may demand an even sterner mastery. The very title " Master " itself implies this, simply because a master who exerts no dominance can be such only in name. And here the analogies to Nature and life are of the closest possible order. All wild animals, individually and collectively, must unconsciously obey an autocratic instinct if they are to survive the ruthless struggle for existence. Very much the same is true of savage communities. " Relentless taboos claim his life in forfeit if he violates the letter of their prescriptions " ;* so that however irrational this may appear to the civilised mind, it is their powerful influence that prepared the thorny path towards the social organisation of to-day. Further, it seems to be increasingly clear that all future social advance, in every direction equally, necessitates more or less drastic regulation, as the entire Western world appears to prove. This principle is accepted, openly or implicitly, by every one of the fiercely contending parties in all countries, so that the actual issue is not whether control is necessary, but whether fascist or democrat, communist or conservative, is to exercise it in practice.

Now since no citizen can claim absolute exemption from these conditions, two crucial difficulties must arise. In the first place, how is personal freedom to be sustained ? For to curtail individual liberty too drastically is plainly to set up a despotism to which no political party would plead guilty in principle, no matter to what lengths it might carry its powers of control. But secondly all really *social* authority must from its very nature be communal or collective, the sole alternative, once again, being a more or less absolute dictatorship ; and although the domination of the executive may certainly be dictatorial in its formal aspects, still this is actually intended merely to ensure due efficiency and not to abolish the ultimate appeal to society at large, even if only to a majority ; to endeavour to evade such an appeal is simply in the long run to sow the seeds of revolution.

If, then, we thus exclude the dictatorship of the individual, as distinguished from that of the social group, it at once

* Dr. R. R. Marett, *Faith, Hope and Charity in Primitive Religion*, p. 58.

becomes the paramount duty of every citizen to fit himself to assume his own degree and type of that co-operative control from which he can himself never escape. Apart from this he is obviously abandoning his inherent claim to exert some share in government, and at the same moment parting from vitally important civil rights. However speciously this may be camouflaged, he thereby sinks into slavery to some authority external to himself, and so becomes an obstacle, dangerous or even fatal, to all finer ideals of social order which demand excellently equipped and free citizens, no matter how diverse their capacities may be.

Now this ideal, admittedly remote though it is, can be attained only by directing and moulding self-expression in such a way that it takes on the higher character of self-realisation. But this necessitates an unavoidable measure of repression. For it is never repression, in itself and as such, that is to be condemned, but only such mischievous forms as were too often applied by our predecessors. Again we must learn from the artist, if not from Nature. The painter, for example, represses his enjoyment of the noonday sun and works in the cold illumination of the north light, in precisely the same spirit as the athlete who represses his appetite for dainties in order to smash some fine record; and when we remember that the word asceticism really means effort and exercise, we realise that the mystic and the saint have something to teach even the most matter-of-fact John Citizen. For all personality has a most complex organisation or structure, which is nevertheless plastic and highly adaptable in spite of its definiteness. In this respect it may be compared to some intricate mechanism which responds, delicately yet precisely, to the varying demands made upon its capacities. Perhaps the best example is a liner's steering and stabilising gear, or the electrical plant in a vast modern power-house. It must never be forgotten, however, that selfhood incalculably outrivals these marvels of adjustment, because its properties are not those of matter but of life and mind. Selfhood is therefore most accurately regarded as the highest type of organism—highest not merely in its actual structure but still more in its limitless potentialities. "We are only at the very threshold of an undreamed-of control over living things, including ourselves," observes Needham;* but this

* *The Great Amphibium*, p. 14.

depends absolutely on the same conditions as govern the rearing of some rare and beauteous plant. This must certainly be provided with abundant food ; but it must also be skillfully pruned, sometimes so drastically that it is cut back almost to the roots, whence it springs up anew in fresh fragrance and colour. For this indispensable culture the plant depends on the gardener ; personality, on the contrary, must exercise its own inherent powers of thought and knowledge, of artistic and moral sensitiveness, so as to combine self-expression with self-repression and transform both into the highest type of self-realisation.

J. E. TURNER.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF BRITISH GUIANA.

UNLIKE its neighbouring West Indian colonies which, prior to the partitioning of Africa, were the most important tropical colonies in the British Empire, British Guiana, Britain's only possession on the mainland of South America, has remained undeveloped during the 130 years it has been under the British Crown. Recently M. Georges Lamy, for twenty-eight years administrator of Madagascar, passed through British Guiana on his way to French Guiana to relieve the Governor of that colony. M. Lamy will direct a 21,000,000 francs development scheme, part of the programme of which is said to be the gradual abolition of the penal settlement at Devil's Island. This announcement, together with the information that a £200,000,000 project has been launched for the peopling and development of the great spaces of tropical Northern Australia, has aroused in the people of Guiana a strong desire almost akin to unrest to see their great country, possessing greater possibilities than most other tropical possessions of Great Britain, at last on the road to development.

The chief cause of the stagnation of the Colony has been the lack of population, coupled with a fear on the part of sugar-planters that new industries would entice the present labour force away from the plantations. With an area of nearly 90,000 square miles, British Guiana has a population of only 310,000 souls, while to people it as thickly as Barbados would require 55 millions. The present labour supply for the sugar plantations, represented by 130,000 East Indians, is adequate, but there is not in the interior of the Colony any vast indigenous population, as in African colonies, constituting a labour supply for the development of hinterland industries of any magnitude, and the introduction of labourers from other colonies may not be welcomed without suspicion by sugar proprietors, who may fear that any resulting raising of standards of living may react to the detriment of their plantations. The history of any industry, apart from sugar, will illustrate this.

The earliest attempts to grow rice in the Colony were thoroughly discouraged. Raiding parties were often sent out

to destroy the rice cultivations of runaway slaves. When the Demerara Bauxite Company began mining operations on the Demerara river their wage scale was on the level of that of similar organisations in the United States employing coloured labour. A rush to the mines set in, and eventually the wage level was lowered and no loss of labour was suffered by the plantations. Indeed, the higher wages had attracted labourers from the neighbouring West Indian colonies. The Republic of Panama, now suffering acutely since the Roosevelt administration has permitted the sale of beer in the Canal Zone, is hastily repatriating West Indians, thus increasing the problems of the already saturated islands. At present there are proposals on foot to settle Jamaicans and Barbadians in British Guiana. A survey of potential settlement areas, chiefly sugar estates, has been made, but it is unlikely that any migration will take place, as the prospective settlers are chiefly semi-skilled labourers, who may not easily adjust themselves to conditions. But there would be a rush the moment any railroad, hydro-electric or other large undertaking began to operate. The British labour that built the Panama Canal is now idle.

The dominant products of British Guiana to-day are sugar and rice, and there is room even here for much expansion. There are about 62,000 acres under sugar cultivation, producing around 100,000 tons of sugar annually, but the total area of easily accessible land, presumably well suited for sugar-cane cultivation and at present not beneficially occupied otherwise, amounts in round figures to 1,620,000 acres. This area, if fully planted and reaped under modern conditions of cultivation and manufacture, could yield a comfortable 2,500,000 tons per annum. The total area under rice is estimated at 77,400 acres, with an annual yield around 80,000 tons of rice. Great extension of the lands under cultivation with rice would result if the prejudice against the colour of British Guiana rice can be overcome in the markets abroad. Mr. H. C. Collier, Secretary of the Canada-West Indian League, while on a recent visit to British Guiana, declared that Canada would be able to absorb the whole of the Colony's rice production, especially if the rice was presented for sale in packets.

There are other resources which are practically illimitable; their utilisation, however, is checked by difficulties of transportation into the interior of the Colony, though the

hinterland road constructed by the aid of Imperial Loans now throws open to the capitalist one of the richest areas of the Colony, being in size equal to Jamaica.

Since the visit of Sir Walter Raleigh to these shores in 1618, the name Guiana has been associated with El Dorado, and with gold. In 1881 a few individuals started placer mining, but it was not until 1885 that gold was found in paying quantities, and since then the industry has progressed steadily, though for a period competition with diamond mining lowered the export figures. Recently, however, due to the world demand for this metal, the industry is attracting almost as much attention as Raleigh's fabled city. The major portion of the gold obtained from the alluvial washings has been won by the tributor, or, as he is locally called, the "Pork-knocker." The origin of this name is unknown, but it was first given to a large class of men who originally started work in the fields as labourers with a claim-holder, and who, after the companies and syndicates ceased working, remained in the districts and continued to "fossick" on their own account on the claims abandoned by their employers. Under the direction of the Colonial Office a geological survey of the Bartica-Potaro-Tiboku triangle, an area rich in mineral resources, is being carried out by Dr. D. R. Grantham, Mr. S. Bracewell, and Dr. Gordon Williams. Dr. Grantham is a geologist of wide experience, having served as assistant geologist to Sir Albert Kitson in his examination of the Kakamega goldfields in Kenya, which aroused so much interest recently. Prior to the arrival of Dr. Williams, Dr. Grantham and Mr. Bracewell paid a visit to the Potaro gold workings with the object of reviewing the types of grounds which are known producers, before the main survey in unknown country was undertaken. In an official *communiqué* issued to the local press they stated that although the pork-knocker had produced so much gold for the country the best results could only be obtained by engineering skill and capital.

Large quantities of diamonds are also found, British Guiana being the world's third largest producer, ranking after South Africa and Brazil. Apart from bauxite, already mentioned, other mineral resources of the colony include magnetite, which has been obtained near the Yarikita and Hotakwai Hills in the North-West District. Referring to

mineral oil and pitch, the late Professor Sir John Harrison, when Director of Agriculture, stated :

The existence of mineral oil in the North-West District has been suspected for many years, pitch or bitumen having been noted there as early as 1750. In 1916-17 two bores were put down at Courida Point and Sangretal Bay. The former was bottomed, at 600 feet, in the decomposition products of closely underlying igneous rock whilst the sinking of the latter had to be abandoned at 440 feet in a thick stratum of water sand. Both these borings were unsuccessful, neither of them giving any reliable indications of the presence of oil in the vicinity. Owing to the unfavourable topographical conditions at the sites selected the cost of boring reached the prohibitory figure of approximately 73 shillings per foot drilled. In 1919 the British Controlled Oilfields Ltd. sent a party of geologists under Mr. George B. Reynolds to examine the oil possibilities of the district. Their final decision was to the effect that in view of the expenditure which must be incurred to prove the existence of what there is at present no reason to believe exists, viz.—an anticline—which can only afford oil of inferior or asphaltic quality . . . the only conclusion which can be arrived at is that it is inexpedient to incur the expenditure necessary finally to dispose of the question at issue.

For the past 180 years pitch and mineral oil have been found on the Essequibo Coast, but their origin has not yet been traced. It may be noted, however, that this region is about the same distance from the Trinidadian pitch lake as is the bitumen lake at Bermudez in Venezuela.

But it is probably in her forests that British Guiana possesses her greatest wealth. The utilisation of these illimitable forest resources has been held in check all these years by the great difficulties of transportation, but there is little doubt that an enormous development of the timber industry should follow the institution of transport facilities by Imperial roads to the Potaro and Mazaruni Districts. Such roads are now under construction.

The trees composing the forests of British Guiana are rarely of social habit, many different kinds of trees existing in any one area, though it is usual for various kinds of trees to predominate, and to give to the locality the name of the prevailing timber, such as the greenheart, wallaba and crab-wood forests. Greenheart is commercially the best known of all the timbers of the Colony. Large quantities have been regularly exported for many years. It is rated as a first-class

wood at Lloyd's and it is chiefly used for submerged works, such as wharves, piles, docks and lock gates. Crabwood, a light wood of reddish colour, takes a high polish, and is much used by cabinet makers. The mora grows to a great size and is plentiful. Its timber, tough, cross-grained and not liable to split, rivals Australian jarrah as the most suitable for use as railway sleepers. Of the two woods mora is definitely superior, but it is not as well known as the Australian product, which is much advertised. Cedar is a reddish-brown wood, of fairly coarse grain. It is serviceable, handsome and valuable, taking a good polish. It is admirable for cigar boxes, and can be recommended for wainscoting rooms. Then there is kakaralli, a greyish-brown wood with a glossy surface, fine-grained and dense, which is known in the Colony to be more durable than the world-famed greenheart. It is extremely hard compared with boxwood, planes hard but well, turns well, and polishes extremely well. Like greenheart, kakaralli resists the toredo, or ship-worm, and barnacles. The trees, which grow tall and straight, are common throughout the colony, being in some places abundant. The bark may be used for tanning.

The earliest Spanish and Dutch traders exchanged beads and other trinkets with the Indians of Guiana for the handsome letter-wood. This is a dark-brown wood, marked in a striking manner with rich nut-brown or black patches, bearing a resemblance to letters or to the markings on a snake's skin. It is fine-grained, and darkens considerably on exposure. The heartwood, which is excessively hard, comparing with ebony, polishes superbly, possessing a lustrous surface, and is used for making walking-sticks, paper weights, paper knives, Tunbridge ware, small ornamental turnery, and for inlaying. The locust is a wood of orange-red colour, of good appearance, and is never attacked by worms or dry rot. It is used for mill-beds, trenails and furniture, and is one of the best woods for building railway carriages. The tree yields a gum resembling anise or copal, used in making varnish.

There are many other woods in the Colony besides those above described, but their mere enumeration would require a separate article. Among other forest resources are the latex of the balata tree, which when tapped and dried forms the balata of commerce, the vanilla, which grows wild, and many fibres suitable for rope-making, such as the giant

bromelia of the Kaieteur Plateau, near that great natural wonder of South America, the Kaieteur Fall. Many of the secrets of the Guiana forest are still to be unlocked to the world by the naturalist and to be commercially exploited by the capitalist.

There are food crops at present cultivated for local consumption, which await only enterprise and organisation to make them exports of world importance. The cassava, or manioc, also grown in West Africa, is a nutritive root long known to the inhabitants of the Colony. Cassava cakes, packed in tins or packets for export, would surely find a ready market abroad, while the possibilities of cassava starch have never been exploited. The flour of the plantain, a fruit resembling banana, is a nourishing infant food, surpassing many patented products at present on the market. The souari or butter-nut, the product of one of the largest forest trees, has also a great future. The fruit generally contains from two to four nuts, which have a reddish-brown, hard shell. The kernels of the seeds are white and of a very agreeable flavour, being considered by many far superior to the well-known brazil nut.

In the earlier part of the last century, British Guiana was celebrated for the high quality of the coffee it produced. Unfortunately, about the time of the cessation of slavery, circumstances beyond the control of the planters necessitated the gradual abandonment of the cultivation. At present the demand in Canada for British Guiana coffee, by the terms of the Ottawa Agreements, cannot be supplied. Three kinds of coffee are cultivated in the Colony, the Arabian or so-called Creole kind, the Liberian, and a cross between these two varieties first propagated at the Onderneeming Experimental Station by Mr. P. M. de Weever, the writer's father, and known as the *Coffea Deweveri*. The three varieties grow with exceptional vigour, there being large areas of low-lying land in British Guiana ideally suited to the growth of coffee. The scarcity of available labour, however, tends to restrict the extension of the area now under cultivation.

British Guiana should also become one of the most important producers of limes and lime products in the world. Limes grow well on the lighter soils of the Colony, if they are protected from the full force of the wind. There are large areas of loose, friable land that are well adapted to the

cultivation of limes, while there is an enormous extent of ferruginous, lateritic soils in many parts of the interior of the Colony, particularly the Rupununi District, on which other citrus fruits, which do not call for the labour force that many crops require, can be successfully grown.

Tobacco grows wildly about the country, being indeed indigenous to British Guiana. There is at present a cigarette factory in the Colony, using principally imported tobaccos, though a few colonists are seriously cultivating this redolent weed. Until recently there was an ordinance restricting its cultivation, with the object of protecting the revenue obtained from tobacco importations. Now that this ordinance is no longer in force, Big Business has the opportunity of putting on the markets of the world either a Demerara Thistle Blend or a Guiana Smoking Mixture.

The sand-hills of Guiana furnish excellent material for the manufacture of glass. Experiments made with the sand which forms the first elevation when penetrating from the sea-coast proved highly satisfactory, as it produced a glassware better than that generally manufactured from sand in the United States. These sand-cliffs are of further interest, as their structure, if judged by analogy, renders it probable that coal may be found in that situation. If this proved to be the fact, a new and valuable resource would be added to those already enumerated. Kaolin of exceedingly fine quality, capable of making first-class chinaware, is also being found in large quantities on the banks of the Corentyne River.

An expert detailed by the Government in 1919 to consider and report upon the possible development of hydro-electric power, estimated that the lower falls on three rivers could develop half a million horse-power. The power running to waste on the larger falls can only be conjectured. It is known that the Kaieteur Fall alone is capable of yielding 1,200,000 horse-power, and there are other giant waterfalls which approach these figures. Nature has probably lavished upon British Guiana more white coal resources than upon any other tropical colony.

From the foregoing it would be clear that the soil of British Guiana is so fertile, its productions are so varied and so rich that the country offers unusual opportunities to the capitalist, provided he is granted proper conditions of security for the investment of capital and the employment of labour.

It should also seem unlikely that, in spite of the fact that within the last two decades alone thirty-one experts have visited the Colony to advise on works of development and in other directions, a country possessing such potentialities should have remained undeveloped for 130 years under the British without any serious effort ever having been made to exploit those resources. Such efforts were made, but each failed. Here we will mention three such proposals.

In 1907 Colonel J. W. Link, an American, of an old Virginia family of prosperous tobacco planters, came to British Guiana. As a young man he had served in the American Civil War, after which he was engaged in engineering work for some years in the Amazon valley. At an early date he seems to have conceived the idea of linking up the Amazon with Georgetown by means of a railway, believing that the possibilities of this port were much greater than those of any other point on the coast of the South American continent, north of the Amazon. Upon the outbreak of the Franco-German War, Colonel Link, recommended by General Sheridan, joined the German forces. After the war he settled in London, becoming a naturalised British citizen in 1870. In 1908 Colonel Link put forward his scheme of railway and rubber development to the Government of British Guiana, but after consideration his proposals were not entertained. He then went to Brazil and secured concessions for that end of the scheme, and returned to British Guiana in November 1911, for the purpose of re-introducing his proposals in a modified form, but in January 1912, Colonel Link died suddenly of a heart attack in Georgetown. His railway scheme died with him.

In July 1912, the new Governor of the Colony, Sir Walter Egerton, arrived with the avowed intention of developing its resources. Realising from the outset the importance of adequate transport facilities Sir Walter proposed to build a railway from Georgetown to the Brazilian frontier on the south-west of the Colony, with the view that in later years private enterprise or the Government of the State of Amazonas would extend the line from the frontier to Manâos on the Amazon river. Sir Walter Egerton himself made three trips into the interior over the proposed route, then in an address delivered to the British Guiana Royal Agricultural and Commercial Society in 1914 he outlined his proposals.

In revising his address for publication in May 1915, the Governor found it necessary to add the following footnote :

There is, in my opinion, no doubt that the people of the Colony are very strongly in favour of the construction of a railway, and the scheme I have laid before the Secretary of State, which is outlined, in some of its aspects, in this paper, has met with the consistent and warm support of the local press. Only on the part of some of the leading men connected with the sugar industry has there appeared an inclination to hold that a very large additional amount must be spent on immigration of labour for the coast districts simultaneously with initiation of railway construction. It will be a pity if an exaggerated anticipation of the effect of railway construction on the labour for the sugar industry should lead to opposition to a scheme which must ultimately benefit every section of the community.

The following year Sir Walter Egerton went on leave and resigned. But the possibilities of railway development still remain.

In 1931 Mr. Henry Ford made an offer to build a motor road through the Colony to his rubber plantation in Brazil, but the conditions attaching to that offer were not acceptable. In the meantime, however, due to the energy of Sir Edward Denham, the present Governor,* a 110-mile road has been built to within a short distance of the Kaieteur Fall, bringing within the reach of tourists and others this famous waterfall. A branch road, tapping the Mazaruni goldfields, runs for seventy-six miles through primeval forest, eliminating many dangerous cataracts on the Mazaruni river, which have hitherto claimed many lives. The need is still felt, however, for a highway to tap the vast interior savannahs, which have been proved very suitable for white settlement, and which adjoin some 12,000 square miles of savannah country in Brazil. The Imperial Government has generously granted loans for road building and for unemployment relief, but further development is almost impossible without the introduction of outside capital for the construction of railways and the building up of new industries. At present there is an American expedition examining the Colony's possibilities ; we would like to see British enterprise take even a like interest in the Colony.

GUY E. L. DE WEEVER.

* Sir Edward Denham is now Governor-Designate of Jamaica. Mr. G. A. S. Northcote, Colonial Secretary of the Gold Coast, it is announced, will be his successor in British Guiana.

A SAGA OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR.

HITHERTO all the poetry of the American Civil War has been partisan poetry, mainly on the Northern side. The fervour of Whitman, the moral earnestness of Whittier, the quaint humour and deep indignation of Lowell, were all exerted on the Northern side. For some occult reason, the poem which has most caught the popular fancy in this country has been Whittier's *Barbara Freitchie* ; though in fact Stonewall Jackson is as much the hero of the story it tells as the nominal heroine. Whittier shows his bias in making Jackson blush at the sight of the Stars and Stripes, whereas the real Jackson was as fully convinced of the righteousness of his cause as even Lincoln was.

A poet has recently arisen to tell the story of the war from a more impartial standpoint, and he has taken for his title the opening words of the familiar song :

John Brown's body lies mouldering in the grave
But his soul goes marching on.

He calls it *John Brown's Body*. The poem has had an immense success in America, and is known and read all over the United States. On this side of the Atlantic, though it was noticed at the time of its appearance by one or two of our more literary reviews, it is still unknown to all but a select few. This fact and the poem's intrinsic merits are a sufficient justification for attempting to introduce it anew to English readers.

Stephen Vincent Benét, the author, was born in 1898, and is the son of a Colonel in the U.S. army. He began publishing verses at the age of 17, and has published more than one volume of poetry. *John Brown's Body*, which is undoubtedly his masterpiece, was published in 1928, at the age of 30. It extends to 377 pages, and is divided into eight books. It covers the whole history of the war, from John Brown's raid to the assassination of Lincoln. Yet it is not in the ordinary sense of the word a history ; I use a more appropriate term when I call it a saga, for as the author says :

My cyclorama is not the shape of the world,
Nor even the shape of this war from first to last,
But like a totem carved, like a totem stained
With certain beasts and skies and faces of men
That would not let me be too quiet at night
Till they were figured.

All the essential part of the history is there, with vivid portraits of the leaders on both sides ; but it is shown by a series of episodes—a cyclorama, as he calls it—part historical and part imaginary. Quite apart from the poetry, the story alone is more interesting than most novels.

I have used the word impartial, but it is the wrong word. Benèt is no reasoner, striking a careful balance between contrary opinions. Rather does he as a poet enter into the spirit of each party in turn and show the war alternately through northern and through southern eyes. He is a Northerner, and his fundamental judgment is for the North, against state rights and against slavery, but his portrait of Lee is as sympathetic and as beautiful as his portrait of Lincoln himself :

Oh, he could bear the shifts
Of time and play the bitter loser's game,
The slow, unflinching chess of fortitude,
But while he had an opening for attack
He would attack with every ounce of strength.
His heart was not a stone, but trumpet-shaped
And a long challenge blew an anger through it
That was more dread for being musical
First, last, and to the end.

His full-length portrait of Lincoln takes the form of a soliloquy. The President is waiting for news of the battle of Antietam in order that if it is a victory he may issue at long last his proclamation freeing the slaves. While he waits he goes over in his mind the events of the previous eighteen months, and his own life and career, as he asks himself the question, "What is God's will ?" This is followed later in the poem by a picture of Lincoln reviewing the troops ("endless columns crunching across new snow") as they start out for the battle-field in the last year of the war :

"So that was him," they say, "So that's the old man.
I'm glad we saw him. He isn't so much on looks
But he looks like people you know. He looks sad all right,
I never saw nobody look quite as sad as that
Without it made you feel foolish. He don't do that.
He makes you feel—I dunno—I'm glad we could see him.
He was glad to see us but you could tell all the same
This war's plumb killin' him. You can tell by his face.
I never saw such a look on any man's face.
I guess it's tough for him. Well, we saw him, for once."

It is the great paradox of the war that while the North was victorious, and had probably the more righteous cause, the romance of the war apart from that one immortal figure, the most heroic leaders, the greatest devotion, the greatest enthusiasm, the heaviest sacrifices, were all on the side of the South. (I say probably the more righteous cause, because one has to realise that to a southerner of that day the logic of the southern position must have seemed quite unassailable. Thirteen independent states had joined together in a voluntary union for their mutual advantage. Surely if they found the partnership no longer advantageous they were entitled to dissolve it! If the issue had not been complicated by the question of slavery, there might have been much to be said for the southern position.)

The North had no generals who could inspire in their men the unwavering trust, the enthusiasm, the devotion almost amounting to worship, which was felt for Lee and Jackson by the men who served under them. There were none who were the equals of Lee and Jackson in military capacity. The disparity of resources between the two sides makes the prolongation of the war for four years little short of a miracle. Nowhere has this been more forcibly pointed out than in President Wilson's *Epochs of American History*.* "Stupendous," he says,

as was the war struggle from every point of view, its deepest and most extraordinary qualities are revealed only when it is viewed from the side of the southern Confederacy. The material resources of the North . . . never lacked or were doubted; they even increased while it spent them. On the part of the South, on the other hand, the great struggle was maintained by sheer spirit and devotion, in spite of constantly diminishing resources and constantly waning hope. Her whole strength was put forth, her resources spent, exhausted, annihilated; and yet with such concentration of energy that for more than three years she seemed as fully equal to the contest as did the North itself. . . . There is in history no devotion not religious, no constancy not meant for success, that can furnish a parallel to the devotion and constancy of the South in this extraordinary war.

All this, and along with it the half-mad fanaticism of John Brown, the greatness of Lincoln, the dogged persistence of Grant, the anxieties of the two capitals separated from each

* Book III, Chap. X.

other by so short a space, are displayed to us in a series of marvellous portraits. There is not a leading figure on either side but is sketched for us, sometimes in half a dozen lines, sometimes in a detailed study, so that we have a definite impression of the man as he lived and was. This power of portraiture, of making his characters live, is one of Benèt's most remarkable gifts. He stands with pencil and sketch-book before each of the statesmen and soldiers in turn, and sets them down with their hopes and their ambitions, their achievements and their failures, so that we say like the troops who had seen Lincoln,

“ So that was he! ”

His fictitious characters are no less alive than the historical. The slow-thinking giant of a Pennsylvanian farmer; the runaway slave; the little overworked, underfed slavey in a southern hotel, whose life is largely made up of boots and beds and slops, but who has her own dreams and her own little spark of romance, are drawn with the same sympathy, the same consummate skill, as he gives to depicting the president of the Confederacy. The most superb of all these portraits is that of the mistress of Wingate Hall,

as slightly made
And as hard to break as a rapier blade,

representative of the Southern women who

Kept the house with the men away
And baked the bricks where there was no clay,
Made courage from terror and bread from bran
And propped the South on a swansdown fan
Through four long years of ruin and stress,
The pride—and the deadly bitterness.

The result is that we get from the poem as living a realisation of the atmosphere of the conflict as we get of the court of Louis XIV from *The Three Musketeers*, or of the spirit of the Middle Ages from *The Cloister and the Hearth*.

After a prelude giving a gruesome account of the experience of a young ship's officer serving for the first time on a Yankee slave-ship, just to give atmosphere and make us feel the full horror of the slave trade, we are shown Jack Ellyat, of Connecticut in the North, wandering in the woods with his

dog on an October afternoon in the year 1860 and wondering whether it will come to war. On the whole, he thinks not. Then the scene shifts abruptly to Georgia in the far south, and we are given an outline of the history of the planter family of the Wingates, and shown young Clay Wingate riding back to Wingate Hall on that same October afternoon, and pondering in his own way the same problem as Jack Ellyat. This gives occasion for a beautiful description of the Georgia autumn with its hot noons and its deep-starred nights,

A brown seed-kernel that splits apart
And shows the Summer yet in its heart,
A smokiness so vague in the air
You feel it rather than see it there,
A brief, white rime on the red-clay road
And slow mules creaking a lazy load
Through endless acres of afternoon.

I like that "endless acres of afternoon." It just gives the sense of the warm sun and the still air, and the feeling that it will be hours and hours before there is any perceptible change.

Jack Ellyat and Clay Wingate appear and reappear throughout the poem, and their fortunes are interwoven with the progress of the struggle. The traditions, the prejudices, the enthusiasms of the South are recreated for us through the medium of the Wingate household. We are shown the contest for Clay Wingate's love between Lucy Weatherby and Sally Dupré. Lucy Weatherby is the purely heartless beauty who likes to keep three admirers on a string at once, and is so beautiful and so charming in manner that she is able to do it. Sally Dupré is one of the neighbouring clan of Appleton and was his playmate as a child, but socially she is regarded as not quite "it" because her mother eloped with and married a French dancing-master. We are shown Cudjo, the coloured butler, whose interests are absolutely bound up with those of the family he serves. He can't understand why John Brown should be stirring up trouble—

Nigger's bizness ain't white folks' bizness.

When the tide of fortune has begun to turn unmistakably against the South there is a moving scene in which Cudjo and Mary Lou Wingate bury the family silver by the light of a

lantern, and look at one another across the grave as the last sod is replaced.

The poem is not faultless—far from it. There are passages which, if they were written in prose, no one would suspect of being anything but prose. There are other passages in which the poet has taken such liberties with his metre as to make it seem almost like free verse. But always the poem is alive. It has always a story to tell or a picture to paint. It is interspersed here and there with lyrics, some of them of outstanding beauty. The song of the Coming of Love :

What things shall be said of you
Terrible beauty in armour ?
What things shall be said of you
Horses riding the sky ?

almost recalls the Song of Solomon. Through it all runs the allegory of John Brown's body, a theme that forms a background to all the varied music of the saga.

Ask the tide why it rises with the moon.
My bones and I have risen like that tide
And an immortal anguish plucks us up
And will not hide us till our song be done.

So at last, when the tale is done, and the grass and weeds have grown above the mouldering bodies of the slain, John Brown's body becomes a seed out of which emerges the age of machinery ; the age of the dynamo and the furnace flame :

So, when the crowd gives tongue,
And prophets, old or young,
Bawl out their strange despair
Or fall in worship there,
Let them applaud the image or condemn
But keep your distance and your soul from them.

And while the prophets shudder or adore
Before the flame, hoping it will give ear,
Say neither, in their way,
" It is a deadly magic and accursed,"
Nor " It is blest," but only " It is here."

S. R. DANIELS.

SCENES IN EASTERN POLAND.

THE four Eastern provinces of Poland are a country of broad low horizons where the sky plays the major part in every view. There are few railways and, save for the two great chaussées leading from Kiev and Moscow to Warsaw, most of the roads are sand tracks. Forest and marsh alternate with open fields, the latter crossed here and there by slowly flowing sandy rivers and dotted with the small grey wooden huts of the peasants. The traveller is left with an impression of illimitable space and time. The only large city is Vilna, which lies in the extreme north : it is an attractive place with many narrow streets bordered by high cloister walls, and a wealth of baroque churches. The town, and the ancient university founded by Stephen Batory, where Mickiewicz, the national poet, studied and was imprisoned, play an important rôle as an influence of Western civilisation through the whole Vilna province. A number of ruined medieval castles and, in the south, vestiges of earthworks thrown up in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries against Turkish invaders remind us that the country is not devoid of history. But, since the early decades of the last century when a series of charming arcaded market halls was built, life, until recently, seems to have stood still even in the towns.

The Kresy Wschodnie or Eastern Marches, as these four provinces—Vilna, Nowogrodek, Polesia and Volhynia—are often termed, covers an area equal to that of England and has a population of some 5,600,000. It stretches from the Russian frontier to a line running roughly north and south from Brzesc (Brest-Litovsk), and is bordered on the north by Lithuania and Latvia, on the south by the Polish province of Galicia. Ever since the advent to power of Marshal Pilsudski's Government much time and money has been spent on the general development of the Kresy, and, as I learnt recently when travelling through the district after several years' absence from Poland, there is already visible evidence of their work. The present problems of the Kresy, however, are by no means as simple as its outward appearance, and each successive Government has been called on not only to undertake the difficult task of administration and development, but also to face three major political problems which cannot be avoided : the development of White Ruthenian

and Ukrainian national movements among the indigenous peasantry, the former in the north, the latter in the south ; Communism ; and the Orthodox Church. All three are inextricably mixed up.

In order that the Kresy and its problems may be fully understood, it is necessary to know something of the antecedents of the district. These four provinces formed part of the territory seized by Russia at the Partitions of Poland at the end of the eighteenth century. Whilst, however, the districts west of Brzesc which had always been essentially Polish were allowed to retain a certain measure of independence, those on the east immediately became an integral part of the State and underwent a rigorous course of Russification. The Polish language was banned, all the peasants who were Uniates were forced into the Orthodox Church in 1838, and dissension was encouraged between large landowners, who were justly regarded as the mainstays of Polish patriotism, and the peasants. But this vast territory east of Brzesc, for many years on the borderland between West and East, Roman Catholicism and Orthodoxy, although it had never been completely Polish, could not in the course of little over a century be made completely Russian. The four provinces handed over to Poland by the Treaty of Riga in 1921 as a share of the ancient "borderland" were no easy heritage.

Both national movements are of post-war growth and are based on language ; Ukrainian has a literature, White Ruthenian has not. The majority of the peasants had not previously been race-conscious and only became so as a result of teaching. Nor were the implications of citizenship comprehensible. What they most readily understood was allegiance to a religion. Roman Catholic was generally synonymous with Pole, but members of the Orthodox Church would call themselves simply Orthodox ; and in some cases they would be merely "of this place." In the early years after the War, when theories of racial independence were widespread, the White Ruthenian movement found champions among certain Polish intellectuals. Support also came from the other side of the frontier which, as a result of the Treaty of Riga, cuts clean across the territories inhabited by the White Ruthenians and the Ukrainians, leaving half on the Polish side, half on the Russian. Bolshevik agents, whilst teaching the peasants that they were White Ruthenians, told them that their real

home was in Russia, where there was a federal White Ruthenian Republic. This was naturally accompanied by Communist propaganda. Owing to a change of policy, support is no longer coming from Moscow, and the movement has lost much of its impetus. But it has gone too far to be suppressed and one more minority race, of growing importance, has thus been added to the long list in Europe.

The much stronger Ukrainian movement in the south (i.e. Volhynia), where the population is wealthier and more developed, has spread since the War from the neighbouring province of Galicia, the centre of Ukrainianism, but which had previously been cut off by the Russian-Austrian frontier. For the moment it has been most successfully diverted by the completely individual policy of the Governor, Jozewski. He has skilfully forestalled subversive teaching by encouraging Ukrainian culture within the bounds of a Polish political framework, and a position has now been reached when it is habitual for meetings of the Government Bloc to be conducted in the Ukrainian tongue. It is doubtful whether this spirit could survive in face of the greater attraction of a Federal Ukrainian State in Galicia—were such a State ever created—but for the time, at any rate, it has produced an era of most unexpected calm.

In as far as the champions of the minorities come from Russia, Communism is mixed up with both the White Ruthenian and Ukrainian Movements, but it also works over a far larger field. Ever since the institution of the collective farm, however, there has been a distinct cooling-off towards Russia, and the news is gradually being spread by Russian peasants, who manage every now and then to escape to Poland, that life under such conditions has not even the merits which are attributed to it. The frontier is carefully guarded on both sides by a special defence force, and on the Polish side there is no part of it which is not visible from one of a series of carefully arranged watch-towers; but it is crossed fairly frequently, particularly in spring, when food is scarce in Russia. Teaching which, it is felt, might pave the way for Communism has recently begun to spread from another and quite unexpected source: the Baptists and other Evangelical preachers. Their greatest success has been in Polesia and southern Volhynia, but it is one for which it is difficult to find an exact reason. The most likely would seem to be that the

peasants being left without moral support from the Orthodox Church, which is in a very decayed condition, have found satisfaction for their spiritual needs in the mysticism and simplicity of the new teaching. Not the least surprising aspect, perhaps, is that the preachers are often converted Jews.

Even if the Baptists have had a certain success, we cannot say the same for the apostles of a revived Uniate Church. But the work deserves our attention if only in view of the immensity of its object, namely, to create a base for the ultimate conversion of Russia to Roman Catholicism. The Uniate Church (more correctly Roman Catholicism of the Eastern rite) came into being as a result of the Union signed at Brest-Litovsk in 1596 between the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox bishops of eastern Poland. The Orthodox were to acknowledge the Pope, and to recognise the supremacy of Rome in all questions of dogma. On the other hand, they were to retain their own rite, the much revered "old Slav" liturgy, and to be allowed independence of action in matters of habit or custom. The marriage of priests, for instance, or the use of certain coloured altar-cloths are regarded as matters of custom, a belief in the Immaculate Conception or Papal Infallibility is a question of dogma. By the Ukase of 1838, when the Russians were in possession of the Kresy, all "lapsed brethren" were once again, as stated above, "admitted" to the Orthodox Church. The process of revival, started by the Bishop of Siedlce and a small group of followers under the influence of Rome, is by no means as simple as the wholesale conversion of 1596, headed by all the ecclesiastics both high and low. The peasants either repel the Union as some form of trickery, or, in the rare cases when they do go over, do so because they wish to be rid of an Orthodox priest who prefers the world to his spiritual duties, or, more likely, who overcharges them. Union is treated as a matter of convenience rather than conscience. So far, 30,000 is a liberal estimate for the number of Uniates in the whole of the Eastern Provinces; but, were the teaching in the hands of the Poles, with a thorough understanding of local conditions and of the Slav mentality, and not those of monks and priests from a variety of foreign countries, it is possible that the revival would meet with more success. Whatever we may feel as to the merits of the ultimate object, it is legitimate to wonder whether Russia is a country in which anything with the taint of Polonism is

likely to meet with success. The Polish Government, it must be added, has never regarded the revival with favour. The Government knows that in many Orthodox minds it will inevitably be connected with the revival; and although it would doubtless be pleased to see the disappearance of the Orthodox Church, it has no desire to stir up a hornets' nest about its ears by incurring an accusation of interference with religious liberty.

The constructive task which the present Government has set itself in these provinces is twofold. It wishes to improve the economic situation of the inhabitants and, by drawing them out of their age-long apathy and stimulating their mental capacity, to put them in a position to benefit from the changes to the full extent. In spite of a fundamental desire to create a closer union between the Kresy and the rest of the country, it has not resorted to any forceful measures. The benefits which the minorities will derive from this constructive policy should reconcile them in some measure to the Polish State; and all the peasants in whom race-consciousness is dormant should be brought within its orbit, owing to the fact that all the constructive work is being done by Polish officials and that they thereby come into friendly contact with the State more and more each year. Moreover, the Poles are helped by the prestige of being now the ruling race, an honour which had previously belonged to Russia.

The greatest change is undoubtedly being effected by the Agrarian Reform Laws, of which the object is the creation of a large class of self-supporting peasantry. The peasants had only been liberated from serfdom in 1866, and at the birth of the new Republic the land was very unevenly distributed between them and the large landowners; some fifty per cent. of the former's holdings were under $12\frac{1}{2}$ acres in size, and thus below what is considered the minimum for subsistence. At the same time, in a typical village where the Reform has not yet taken effect, it is not unusual for a holding to be divided into as many as ten or twenty different strips, scattered about in different places, and of the most surprising dimensions. One may see plots of land scarcely large enough to graze a cow, and others that are perhaps $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles long and but 10 yards wide, the latter a crystallised survival of the ancient three-field system. Not only are such holdings most difficult to cultivate, but a great deal of land is wasted on roads and

boundaries. Though in somewhat less aggravated form, similar conditions prevailed everywhere in Poland. Here, however, the medieval picture was completed, for grazing lands were sometimes held in common by a whole village, and the peasants had retained their ancient rights of pasturage and wood collection on the large estates to which they had previously been tied.

Under such conditions life is possible, but little more. Many of the peasants, among whom twelve children in a family is not abnormal, are desperately poor. Even those with dwarf holdings may be able to produce enough for their own nourishment, but they have no surplus to sell. Their needs, it is true, are few. Their huts have two rooms, one for the family, one for the animals, both with floors of beaten earth. The women often grow and spin their own flax, and in any case they weave the linen from which they make their clothes. Fences are tied together with birch twigs, thus avoiding the use of nails, and shoes for use in the fields are made of woven birch bark. But salt and sugar have to be bought, and also such things as boots for the cold weather. The most frequent excuse for non-attendance at school in the winter is that the children have nothing to wear, and in most cases it is one which the schoolmasters know to be true.

As a result of the Acts of 1920 and 1925 and certain subsidiary Acts conditions are in a state of rapid change. The holdings are being unified; the easements are being liquidated; and the progressive reduction of the arable area of large estates to a maximum of 450 acres is providing land for parcellation among the holders of dwarf properties or for the creation of new holdings for the landless. The unification of the holdings in the Vilna district has been completed in twenty-eight per cent. of the villages, and both here and in the other provinces it is estimated that the whole work will be completed in fifteen years. The employees of the Land Bureaux, in spite of the delicate nature of their task, appear everywhere to be on the best of terms with the local population, and in many cases they are so interested in every detail of their work that it is a rare pleasure to travel with them. The liquidation of the easements (by which the peasant receives a certain area of land in return for the surrender of his rights) and the work of parcellation have been left as much as possible to private initiative under official supervision. The

easements should all have been liquidated two years hence. The parcellation has not been effected on as radical a scale as in certain other countries, for it is realised that the large estate has its own rôle to play in State economy, particularly in cases where it is the centre of a rural industry. In practice, the law is only regulating a natural tendency ; for the large proprietors, assured in the possession of their forests, are in most cases only too delighted to find purchasers for a part, or all, of the rest of their land.

In every aspect of the Reform one cannot help noticing the Government's desire to promote the spirit of self-help, and its belief in the force of example ; experienced farmers are settled, wherever possible, under the obligation to advise their neighbours ; where land needs drainage, as is often the case, the peasants are given expert advice, but left to put it into practice themselves ; agricultural schools have been founded for the sons of peasants. The Government is carrying its work to a logical conclusion by assisting the growth of co-operative societies for the sale of surplus produce, and by providing an assured market for flax, of which it is actively promoting the home production.

The three branches of the Reform are carried out concurrently, and when completed the village should consist of a group of compact holdings all above the minimum in size. The village street, dusty in summer, thick mud in winter, disappears ; for the houses, all crowded together and built of wood with thatched or shingle roofs, are taken to pieces and transported to the owner's new and compact holding.

The removal of the houses from the village street is in a certain sense symbolic of a change which takes place in the owners themselves. They become more independent, and lose their inherent sense of subservience to the common will or custom. All observers in the country are agreed that not only has production been increased, but that the peasants have gained in self-respect and initiative. The beneficial effects of the Agrarian Reform on the life and development of the Kresy will be remembered for all time.

Travelling in the east of Poland one has the constant impression that the country is waking out of a deep slumber. This feeling is the result of many things, besides Agrarian Reform, which cannot be dealt with here in full. There are the elementary schools, even in the remote villages, where

eighty per cent. of the children receive education as opposed to thirty-six per cent. in 1922, and where they learn from the earliest age that they are Polish citizens and that they share in the inheritance of a tradition greater than that of their own village. At Lida there were two particularly fine schools, one elementary, the other secondary, both equipped with admirable laboratories, and the former with a model counter at which any child who wished could, in its final year, be taught approved methods of serving in a shop. Details such as this, of which there are innumerable examples, would never have been dreamed of ten years ago. Then there are the small towns, such as Pinsk, or Lida itself, centres of a growing civilisation and incidentally of Polonism. Their influence on the country round will continue to increase in proportion with the improvement of communications. In the Nowogrodek province thirty miles of metalled road were built last year, and this year, by utilising the whole of this province's share of the new State Employment Fund, it is hoped to construct some ninety more. Lastly, there are the widespread Youth organisations which now exist in practically every village. Mental action in the young is stimulated by play-acting and similar pursuits, and under the admirable guidance of the Society of Country Youth they are taught to realise that chicken do not suffer from being regularly fed, and that fruit-growing is, to say the least of it, a useful pastime. Their early training, coupled with that which the boys receive during their military service, turns out something which is very different from the older generation, and in many cases Youth rejoices in the fact.

I ended my tour at Korzec, a small town on the Russian frontier. On both sides the landscape and the inhabitants were identical. On the Russian side were a deserted church and village and the long, low dwelling-house of a co-operative farm out of which the peasants were trooping to their daily work; on the Polish, a privately owned sugar factory and a group of reorganised and independent holdings. Two civilisations stand face to face. It remains to be seen which will prove the more enduring.

M. B. WINCH.

THE CONQUEST OF THE AZTEC GODS.

HOW was it that in the early sixteenth century a few hundred Spaniards were able to subdue the vast and populous region that we now call Mexico? It is true that the invaders possessed a dozen small cannon, but these early firearms were almost equally dangerous at either end. It is true that the invaders possessed nearly a score of horses, a terrifying novelty at that time and place. But the novelty would have soon worn off, and the terror spread over seven hundred thousand square miles must have been a trifle thin. What then is the explanation of the Conquest?

I had always understood that the Aztecs were a gentle and confiding people, and this seemed to be the reason of the Spanish success. It had struck me as a nasty jab at disarmament. When I got to Mexico I discovered my mistake. The conquest of the Aztecs by the Spaniards is not a triumph of militarism over meekness. Far from forming an argument against pacifism, it forms an argument for it.

It was in the Museum at Mexico City that enlightenment came to me. There I found a great room given over to the stone carvings of the ancient races. A few of these sculptures were both fine and beautiful. I saw a rattlesnake with scales of cunning workmanship. I saw a man's head that might have been fashioned in ancient Greece, save that the profile with its beaked nose and short pouting upper lip was typically Mexican. But the greater number of carvings represented the old gods. These, and in particular such as were of Aztec origin, struck me as the most horrible objects that my eyes had ever lit upon. I am not criticising their artistic merit. From this point of view they are immeasurably superior to the totems of African or of Red Indian worship. It is just in this that lies their horror. The hall is a nightmare, an orgy of petrified obscenity.

At first the full meaning did not come home to me. I gazed blankly at great squatting stone forms with greedy, leering faces and large bowls sunk before them. One in particular riveted my attention. There was a foul delight in his expression as, with fat protruding tongue, he licked sensuous lips. Over what could this god be gloating? What was the purpose of the great round bowl between his feet? And the little incised channel, what had flowed along it? To gain

enlightenment I bought a guide. It was in Spanish, and my acquaintance with that tongue was both very recent and very brief. Indeed, my whole education in connection with Mexico seemed to have been deplorably neglected. Still, I might be able to make out something. I began slowly to translate. As I laboured on, a dreadful disgust began to crawl over me. It could not be true, I reassured myself. My lack of Spanish was the fault. The stone bowl could not have been filled with the still-quivering hearts torn from living men and women. The channel could not have drained off the over-brimming human blood. Twenty thousand victims could not have been sacrificed in a single year. No, it was impossible. Such things could not be.

But, even as I denied, I knew that such things had been. No lesser horror could have produced the evil joy upon that carved stone face, upon all these carved stone faces. Besides, I now saw corroboration in surrounding statuary. A man, presumably a priest, was bearing a platter of what my awakened eyes recognised as human hearts. It must have been a good likeness of some definite man, for I met him again unmistakably in another group. And there was a figure of tragic countenance with a great hole in his breast. Without the guide I knew that this had been one of the victims. They were tearing out his heart.

But twenty thousand such sacrifices in a single year. It still remained incredible. Even were the number exaggerated, how could it be true? The Aztecs would have risen in revolt against their gods. No race could have survived that annual offering. Then I read further, and this too was explained. It was not their own people, but captives taken from other tribes, whom the Aztecs sacrificed. But if this was their custom, the Aztecs could have hardly been the gentle and confiding race of my imagination. No, very much the opposite. And these other tribes who supplied victims to gods not even of their own, how maddened, how despairing they must have grown. To them these strange white men from over the sea must have come not as conquerors but as saviours. They would joyfully have banded with them against the Aztec oppressor and his monstrous deities. In this lay the explanation of the Spanish Conquest. It is a very old one. "For all that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

It happened that the very next day was the Feast of Our
VOL. CXLVI.

Lady of Guadalupe. It is held yearly on December 12th, for this is the anniversary of the Madonna appearing to a poor Indian in those first years of Spanish dominance. A church was to be built on the spot where she was standing ; this was the instruction that the Virgin gave. The message was duly reported to the Spanish bishop. He told the Indian to go back. If the Virgin came again, she was to be asked for a token. Not only did the Virgin come again, but a rose-bush beside her broke into bloom. The Indian must pick the roses, the Madonna said, and take them in his blanket as the required token. But when, in the bishop's presence, the blanket was unfolded, not only were there roses but also a portrait of the Virgin stamped upon the material. It is this pictured blanket that is said to hang above the altar at Guadalupe. On this day once a year it is uncovered.

The feast is not only observed at Guadalupe itself ; every town in Mexico seems to have its own church of Guadalupe which is furbished up at this season for the holding of special services. Naturally, however, the actual locality of the Virgin's appearance is the holy of holies. People journey there from all over the country, by foot and by horse, by motor and by train. The greatest contingent is from Mexico City, of which Guadalupe is practically a suburb. The gentry ride out in their cars, but most people, and I among them, took the tram. For once there was no difficulty in discovering the route. Everything that was full to overflowing was going to Guadalupe, and everything not going to Guadalupe was empty. You had only to board any swarming tram that stopped and try to struggle in. At first this seemed impossible. Was there room for a single other person ? The kindly Mexicans inside squeezed a little tighter and some half a dozen more were added at every halt. It was a second Guadalupe miracle, a widow's cruse that in this case was never filled.

The second of my usual problems, that of knowing when to get off, was likewise solved. The whole company got off together. Indeed, it was impossible for the tram to go any further, for the road had turned into a fair ; every road in the entire neighbourhood had turned into a fair. A few of the vendors had set up stalls, but these were the Selfridges of the *fiesta*. For the most part the wares were spread on the ground, although usually with an intervening mat or rug. There were gay piles of fruits, sundry trays of strange-looking sweets,

billowing waves of huge straw hats, Woolworth glasses, ordinary paper cracker caps, delightful peasant pottery. Overhead were strings on which flapped bits of vivid material, too soiled for sale, too desultory for shade ; the purpose may have been merely to attract attention to the goods beneath. A man with two or three pairs of trousers over his arm was strolling about crying *pantalone, pantalone*, presumably in case anyone had mislaid this important article of attire. At one place, a little *plaza* formed a green and wooded oasis, round which were various fires with great cooking-pots. In one, a turkey had been stewing whole. The bird was now withdrawn, and, after being torn into suitable portions, chiefly by hand, was proffered to the company. But such a delicacy was only for the millionaire. Ordinary folk paid a small sum and something was fished out at random—the head of the turkey, or the jawbone of a sheep, or perhaps a fowl's drumstick ending in a foot, a veritable pot-luck. I longed to try my fate, but even my obedient and enterprising digestion, trained to assimilate local colour, jibbed at the idea of such a meal.

Naturally the centre of attraction was the basilica which stood in the centre of these bright and noisy market streets. Like all the old Spanish edifices, it has a certain distinction, but on the whole it is disappointing. San Luis Potosi, where I had passed a month, has many more beautiful churches. Seen from the hills above, this town forms a rosy flowering of domes and towers. The white plaster-covered basilica at Guadalupe seemed by comparison a little theatrical. However, it might be more impressive inside.

The task of getting in was almost as difficult as that of boarding the tram, but it was finally achieved. The church was bigger than I had expected. Doubtless the removal of the seats, and the great packed crowd, increased the impression. It seemed dark after the blazing sunshine of the street, despite the gilded candelabra with their electric bulbs and the lighted tapers held by many of those present. Then I noticed that the congregation was not a constant body : a sort of human glacier was slowly moving from one door to the other. Even the candles had no permanence. As their holders went out, they gave up their tapers, which were hurried round and again issued at the entrance. I do not know if this proclaimed generosity on the part of the purchasers, or if the whole business was conducted on the hire system. Meanwhile, three

priests in gorgeous golden vestments were at the altar conducting the service in the detached manner of the Roman Catholic Church. There were acolytes with swaying incense ; there was music. The picture above the altar was now discernible. I saw a fair young face, gentle and devout, a girlish figure in a shell-like enveloping cloak of stars. How beautiful, how tender, I felt appreciatively.

Suddenly there came back to me the horrible grinning countenance of the stone god at the Museum. The Spaniard, with all his cruelty and oppression, did, after all, bring something to this country. He replaced a religion of hideous savagery by a religion that was—nominally—one of love. It is true that suffering must have gone to build these mighty churches, but the natives, perhaps out of contempt, were spared the terrors of the Inquisition. And in place of a brutal Aztec deity holding between his feet a bowl of red, pulsating hearts, the Indian was given an innocent girl to worship, with crimson roses flowering as she trod.

EDITH ZANGWILL.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

HERR HITLER'S CONSEQUENCES.

RECENT events have had the incidental effect of directing a less antagonistic, almost a lenient, general interest in Herr Hitler and his works. The climax of antagonism was reached in the last week of July, when the assassination of Herr Dollfuss was directly traceable to Nazi German intrigue. But the very completeness of the misfortune that is modern Germany has had paradoxically good effects. When A and B both distrust C, there develops a form of sympathy between A and B. Herr Hitler has had the effect of fostering the sympathy and improving the tone of nearly the whole world outside Germany. He helped to bring Russia into the League of Nations, thereby rescuing the League itself from an apparently inevitable collapse. He provoked a Franco-Italian reconciliation which ended the bitter feud of a decade. By the same token he revived the hope that next year's naval conference may not wholly fail. The cause of naval disarmament in 1922, 1927 and 1930 alike was baulked precisely by the Franco-Italian deadlock. Even if the Japanese problem be solved next year it will be necessary, if the conference is to succeed, also to solve the Franco-Italian problem. It is Herr Hitler who has inclined France and Italy towards reason and friendship, so that there is now a chance that they may compose their chronic differences about naval armaments. It follows that not only Europe, but the whole world has cause for gratitude, left-handed as it may be, to Herr Hitler.

If one recalls the circumstances attending the murder of Herr Dollfuss one can hardly be surprised that they made an impression on normal people. Not only had Munich frankly broadcast the threat; there was other evidence in appalling abundance. On July 19th, only six days before Herr Dollfuss was assassinated, Herr Alfred Frauenfeld, the Nazi regional leader of Vienna, broadcast from the Munich station the undisguised threat that if certain Nazi terrorists then waiting trial in Austria were condemned, Herr Dollfuss would be killed. On July 20th there began a widespread series of bomb outrages in Austria. On July 22nd a consignment of German bombs was seized on the Swiss-Austrian frontier. On July 23rd a similar consignment was seized on its way from

Bavaria to Austria. It could be proved that the explosives used in the Socialist and Communist outrages perpetrated in Austria were supplied by the Nazis. Every day the Munich station attacked Herr Dollfuss as the barrier to Austria's destiny as a German nation. On the day itself (July 25th) it was Dr. Rieth, German Minister in Vienna, who negotiated with the surviving members of the Austrian Cabinet for the safe conduct out of Austria of the Nazi assassins. On the evening of that day every wireless station in Germany broadcast the identic story that the Austrian "rising" had been directed personally against Herr Dollfuss as a traitor to Austria.

There is no room even for doubt about the facts. Even the method employed for the murder of Herr Dollfuss was that of daylight gangsters who forced their way into the Chancellory and held up the Cabinet, then meeting, at the point of the revolver. Herr Dollfuss was shot and callously allowed to bleed to death. There cannot be many analogies in history to Herr Hitler's deadly efficiency in antagonising every decent person everywhere. He himself, however, seems to be wholly unaware of his own qualities. On September 12th he held his first Presidential reception of the foreign ambassadors in Berlin. This is what he said to them: "It is my unshakeable will to make Germany a stronghold of peace." The odd thing is that Herr Hitler has indeed made Europe almost secure from war. The very friendlessness of Germany is an asset for peace.

TRADE AND POLITICS IN AMERICA.

The cotton textile strike that started in the United States on Saturday, September 1st, showed how big were the conflicting forces that had been set loose by the attempted political control of commerce. The strike itself was of big proportions. It involved physical outrage and bloodshed. But there is something of deeper interest in it than is suggested by the immediate context. It symbolises an outstanding feature of the material conditions in which most of the world now lives: the increasing extent to which human life in all its phases, economic, financial, even spiritual and cultural, is subject to political management. The main difference between what is happening in the United States and what is happening elsewhere is that up to last year the United States

had preserved much of its individualist freedom, whereas every other "civilised" country except Japan was in greater or less degree socialised—that is, planned by its politicians. Of the Great Powers, Russia, Italy, Germany and Great Britain have for many years in varying degrees been used to a condition of life in which the individual cannot move hand or foot without his Government's permission, approval and control. In the United States by contrast individual freedom, enterprise and responsibility were still the ruling motive until last year, when Mr. Roosevelt by a combination of unfortunate circumstances found himself competent to impose upon the country a comprehensive plan of political dictatorship. Whereas in other countries the suppression of personal freedom had been gradually accomplished by the slow spread of socialist practice, in the United States the change was sudden and total. Its suddenness gave a strong impetus to the cause of what is called, but miscalled, "organised labour": the cause which seeks, on governmental authority—that is, by virtue of the power of an electoral majority—to dictate to employers of labour the terms and conditions on which they shall conduct their own business.

When, at 11 p.m. on September 1st, the cotton textile workers in the Southern States began their great strike their objects were these: (1) a reduction of the hours of labour from forty (the original figure prescribed in Mr. Roosevelt's cotton textile code) to thirty-four a week, without any reduction of weekly wages (in a six-day week, that would work out at less than six hours a day); (2) the reinstatement of all workers who had been discharged for belonging to the Textile Workers' Union; (3) the recognition by the employers of the Textile Workers' Union as an organisation holding plenary power over all the textile workers in their relationship with their employers; (4) the abandonment by the employers of their right to assign more looms to one weaver; (5) the appointment of a tribunal of arbitration, which should be competent to settle disputes between employers and workers. In other words the control of employers by workers—which is the central object of all socialism that derives its power from an electoral majority—had within two years of Mr. Roosevelt's launching his plan gone beyond that plan. In its crude simplicity the plan was this: that in any industrial enterprise in which a capitalist sinks his capital,

the respective functions of capital and labour shall be thus divided : labour shall decide how little work it does and how much it shall be paid for doing it, and shall decide what men or women the employers shall employ ; the employers shall pay the wages and continue to make the enterprise succeed, no matter what it may cost to produce the goods and what the goods can be sold at. To the detached student the interesting thing is this : Capital and labour are necessarily opposing forces, for it is the business of capital to make capital as remunerative as possible, and it is the business of labour to obtain the highest possible wage. Both sides are right. The game is fair. "Organisation" is fair, both for capital and for labour. It is a wholly sound device for labour to organise itself, if it can, so that by means of a strike it can force higher wages from employers, just as it would be wholly right for capital to force down wages, if it could, by agreed common action among employers, including the device of a lock-out. The two forces, if left to themselves, would find their own level, because capital cannot dispense with labour any more than labour can dispense with capital. If labour be abundant, it is either cheap or, if artificially kept dear, the balance is redressed by unemployment. What is neither fair nor practical is that labour should use political means to coerce capital by virtue of the democratic fact that the workers outnumber the capitalists. A hold-up on the high road is hardly justified on any exalted criterion by the mere fact that the robbers outnumber the victims. The democratic basis of political civilisation may make socialism inevitable because it ensures the triumph of the majority over the minority. That is the triumph of force. But it does not follow that it is fair or practical. It is not practical because an employer of labour, using his own capital, must himself decide the conditions on which he can profitably employ it or he will not employ it. Why should he ? From his point of view he had better squander it in riotous living. It is the demonstrable fact that in present socialist conditions large hoards of capital are lying idle and are not used for industrial enterprise, because they cannot profitably be so used.

Something of interest, therefore, is to be gained by tracing the consequences of the New Deal (to give the process the absurd name by which it is commonly known) launched by Mr. Roosevelt in the late spring of last year. The process itself

has been so involved and so many-sided that it is not easy to keep the main outlines clear in one's mind. Its essential feature is the attempt by the political authority to dictate to industry the basic terms of hours and wages on which it is to be conducted. It is now possible to consider the results of that attempt as so far established. Let it be remembered, in defence of Mr. Roosevelt, that when on March 4th, 1933, he became President of the United States, the provocation presented to him to attempt something new in American experience was almost overwhelming. Indeed, he was forced by circumstances and by an expectant nation to take immediate action, of his devising, to meet an appalling emergency. On that day no bank in New York was open, a nation-wide panic had burst, the banking and general financial system had stopped functioning. The extent of the panic was illustrated by the fact that he had himself been shot at, and narrowly missed, by an assassin. In his inaugural address he announced that he would himself ask Congress (if Congress itself would not take action) for "broad executive power to wage war against the emergency . . . as if we were in fact invaded by a foreign foe." He stated that "the withered leaves of industrial enterprise lie on every side." Such was his justification. He gave it as his view that "the rulers of the exchange of mankind's goods have failed through their own stubbornness and their own incompetence, have admitted their failure and abdicated." He was promptly given virtually full powers by Congress to translate the United States into what was currently foreshadowed in the political circles as a "balanced social State" through the regulation of hours and wages and the general control of industry. His full plan embraced the immediate relief of unemployment by public works, a scheme of fiscal economy and plans for economic and financial reorganisation. His economic plan was to establish dictatorial control over all industry and in particular to fix minimum wages and maximum hours of work, to regulate production and in other ways to promote, encourage and demand what he called "fair competition." The instrument he fashioned was the National Industrial Recovery Act, which tabulated a series of "codes of fair competition." The cotton textile code, for example, prescribed that cotton operatives should have a forty-hour week and a minimum wage of twelve dollars. When he signed N.I.R.A. on June 16th, 1933—it had been

passed by the House of Representatives on May 27th and by the Senate on June 13th—he announced that his object was “to restore our rich domestic market by raising its vast consuming capacity.” He stated dogmatically that less work and more pay was the means to that end. “The idea,” he explained, “is simply for employers to hire more men to do the existing work by reducing the working hours of each man’s week and at the same time paying a living wage for the shorter week.”

He therefore had a theory. It was essential to his theory that prices should be kept low so that the increased paper wages should remain real wages and thus not defeat his object of restoring the “rich domestic market” by “raising its vast consuming capacity.” He gave the specific warning that “if we now inflate prices as fast and as far as we increase wages, the whole project will be set at naught.” It was a surprising theory. To keep up wages—that is, costs, while keeping down prices—that is, profits—was to attempt a complete reversal of the ordinary cycle of business, exemplified by Mr. Henry Ford, of expanding profits, expanding production, expanding employment, expanding consumption. Mr. Roosevelt put expanding consumption first and expanding profits last from an apparently moral, not economic, differentiation between the interests of different classes of consumers, for increased dividends, resulting from increased prices, would on economic grounds be at least as good a means of increasing consumption as would an increase in wages, even if the increased wages could retain their real relative value. Every boom since 1897 has followed the cycle above described. By reversing it, or stipulating its reversal, Mr. Roosevelt was making an unbusinesslike demand upon employers which many employers simply could not grant, if they would; and at the same time he was exciting the socialist appetite into hopes that never could be fulfilled (as socialist hopes obviously never can be fulfilled if the satisfaction even of the socialists themselves be the criterion). The fact that not much more than twelve months after Mr. Roosevelt launched a cotton textile code based upon forty working hours a week the entire body of cotton textile workers were on strike for a thirty-four-hour week, illustrated both the futility of a forty-hour week itself, when imposed from the outside against the economic grain, and the essentially insatiable nature of a cause whose main

object is to ensure that a minimum of work be done for a maximum of pay, on the absurd ground that prosperity is a capitalist preserve. Moreover, Mr. Roosevelt's codes made the specific claim that "employees shall have the right to organise and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing." Within three months of those codes being promulgated the workers of the United States were on strike from coast to coast, for the central principle of collective bargaining had been seized upon as a simple device for enforcing ever-increasing wages and ever-dwindling work. They even bit the hand that fed them; for on October 13th three labour unions sent out a band of strikers to march upon the headquarters of N.I.R.A. itself. As month followed month the industrial upheaval in the United States increased in intensity, until Mr. Roosevelt, after an experience of fourteen months, was constrained to consider the revision of his own handiwork, with what result history had not told when these lines were written.

N.I.R.A. was given the best possible chance by the chaotic conditions out of which it arose, for the whole nation was ready to follow a lead. It was launched with the emotional uplift of an exaggerated "ballyhoo." The "blue eagle" insignia was featured as the insignia of an almost holy crusade. General Johnson, the administrator of the Act, organised the initial campaign with such enthusiasm that even employers wondered if they could not safely abandon the fruits of their experience and the dictates of their common sense in the expectation that the very force of national exaltation would carry the thing through, as it carries a nation through wars and other absurdities. Thirteen codes applicable to particular industries were forthwith promulgated, capped by a general or "blanket" code designed for industry as a whole for the limited period to December 1st, 1933. In the opening days of the campaign no fewer than 700,000 employers who in the aggregate employed 6,000,000 workers signed the codes. General Johnson boldly and confidently anticipated that by September 4th (Labour Day) the whole field of American industry, in which some 35,000,000 workers are employed, would be harmoniously working in the new conditions. On July 29th, eleven of the New York banks—which in March had been castigated by Mr. Roosevelt—announced their willingness to finance the schemes contained

in N.I.R.A. for the production and distribution of raw materials, food and other goods. But the patriotic spirit (for such indeed was the spirit that supported Mr. Roosevelt) was short-lived. As early as October 1933 the farmers of the Middle West lost patience because prices were not rising. It was even more essential to them than to the industrialists that prices should rise. Mr. Roosevelt had decreed that prices should not rise. In his embarrassment he conceded a measure of the monetary inflation which the farmers demanded and thereby upset the bankers and the industrialists in the East. Although on September 12th, 1933, General Johnson could declare that eighty-five per cent. of employers acknowledged allegiance to the blue eagle, it was already obvious that many of them did so as "chisellers," that is as a means of warding off attention from their own disregard of the codes' provisions. Also the newspaper and publishing businesses began to chafe under the appearance that they were being controlled by Washington. But the chief danger that emerged was that the workers' organisations looked wistfully but not wisely at the instrument that had been put into their hands. On October 10th General Johnson felt it necessary to warn the unions against the temptation to organise their own direct strikes. The warning was both ineffective and difficult to reconcile with the contemporary activity of the Administration itself. It happened that the coal owners had stubbornly resisted the coal code. Throughout October Mr. Roosevelt and the United Mine Workers' Union combined to force the coal-owners into submission, and the form of pressure used by the Union was precisely that of a strike. It was not till the beginning of November that the coal-owners capitulated and accepted the full demands made by the unions and Mr. Roosevelt. In October also the farmers' strike, in this case waged, not on the side of Mr. Roosevelt but against him, assumed alarming proportions. Its object was to force up the price of agricultural produce by starving the market. The Governor of North Dakota supported that object by placing an embargo upon the export of wheat from the State. In the South Senator Thomas of Oklahoma led a farmers' agitation in favour of inflation and of a guaranteed price of 20 cents a pound for cotton. In the Middle West five governors of agricultural States went in a deputation to Mr. Roosevelt, to demand the fixing of a guaranteed price for

about a dozen of the chief agricultural products. The demand was rejected.

Mr. Roosevelt, in short, had already found that the machinery of commerce is a complicated and sensitive thing. His initial simplicity in assuming that he could simply decree increased wages and reduced work involved him in a commitment to keep down prices. The keeping down of prices made impossible the recovery of prosperity among the farmers. It was another of his essential objects, as he expressed it on October 22nd, "to establish and maintain a dollar which will not change its purchasing and debt-paying power during the ensuing generation." How such an object could be achieved out of the President's chair baffles the imagination. But he boldly affirmed on the same day that the Government "must take firmly in its own hands the control of the gold value of the dollar." He set up a gold market of his own device. Commerce is the natural growth of human interests of an infinite variety, a manifestation of life, that adjusts itself to varying conditions and finds its own level in the ever-changing circumstances. The waving of a politician's wand over commerce is interesting only as a curiosity. The effect upon the politician is still more curious. Mr. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, on November 11th last gave expression to some of the perplexities that had dawned on him in a short experience. "We absolutely must," he said, "receive great quantities of goods from abroad and must not be disturbed by the clamour of the people who are hurt thereby. If we follow a national programme, we must resolutely plan to keep fifty million acres of land out of use, no matter how loud may be the outcry of certain carrying, handling and exporting interests."

At the end of Mr. Roosevelt's first year of office there gathered in Washington (March 5th, 1934) a vast body of N.I.R.A. code officials. There were 4,000 of them. They discussed the business done. Mr. Roosevelt took the occasion to reaffirm what he still was driving at. His object, he said, was "to increase the buying power of wage-earners and farmers so that industry, labour and the public may benefit through building up the market for farm and factory goods." He admitted his "social" motive: "Never again will we permit the social conditions which allowed vast sections of our population to exist in an un-American way, which allowed a maldistribution of wealth and of power."

Three months later in a message to Congress (June 8th) about the business of the next Congress he showed himself to be increasingly bent upon the social part of his object. He said that the Government would plan for "the security of the men, women and children of the nation," by such means as the modernisation of houses and the building of new ones, the better use of the nation's land and water, and social insurance against unemployment and old age. It is normally found by all democratic governments that once they embark upon the socialist path they can never turn back, but must ever offer more and more to the electorate. The American election will take place in November. Already the President of the American Federation of Labour has demanded that Mr. Roosevelt introduce legislation to establish a thirty-hour week in all industries : a five-hour day for six days a week. Mr. Roosevelt himself has apparently felt the inevitability of moving in that direction. On August 22nd he ordered a reduction in the hours of work in the cotton garment industry from forty to thirty-six a week and an increase of ten per cent. in the minimum rates of pay. Yet it is at the same time obvious that there must be a limit to such politics. Much of Mr. Roosevelt's initial support came from Republican members of Congress. It is one of the normal duties of a politician to blow and to blow cold. While Mr. Roosevelt was promising less and less work and more and more pay to the electoral majority, he was concurrently offering the very opposite to allay the growing restiveness of the Republican members of Congress. On the very same day that he ordained less work and more pay for the cotton garment makers (August 22nd) his Secretary of Commerce broadcast an address, in which he said that it was not the Administration's object to destroy private initiative or to eliminate the motive of profit in industry. He explained that N.I.R.A. aimed merely at putting private enterprise back on its feet, in which happy event private enterprise would be given back "responsibilities which, under normal conditions, belong to business." *Facilis descensus*. . . . It is impossible for any democratic country to retrace its steps from socialism ; for at each succeeding election the main competitive appeal is the offer of more and more benefits to the majority at the expense of the minority. Mr. Roosevelt's offers have not been uniformly well chosen. Within five days of his offered boon

to the cotton garment industry, that industry held a representative meeting and unanimously decided to reject it on the ground that it was no boon at all, and that its effect would be to increase unemployment in the industry.

N.I.R.A. has been operative for fifteen months. On September 1st last the textile strike leaders claimed that the strikers numbered 1,000,000. That was an overstatement, but they did number nearly 700,000. The official objective was given as a thirty-four-hour week, but the chairman of the strike committee announced to the silk workers who plunged into a sympathetic strike that the objective was a thirty-hour week. The N.I.R.A. itself was split. Some of its officials were more impatiently socialist than others. Mr. Richberg, Secretary of the President's Co-ordinating Committee, and Miss Perkins, Secretary for Labour, launched a broadside attack upon the chief administrator, General Johnson, himself, on the ground that his bias was to the Right. Mr. Lewis Douglas, Director of the Budget, resigned his post on September 2nd last in protest against the vast and increasing governmental expenditure, the extravagance of which contrasted with Mr. Roosevelt's initial promise of fiscal economy. Mr. William Green, President of the American Federation of Labour, has stated that the present total of unemployment is 11,000,000 and is increasing by nearly half a million a month. The Government is spending \$175,000,000 (say £35,000,000) a month for the relief of unemployment alone. The administrator of Federal Emergency Relief announced on August 31st that the funds already voted to that purpose by Congress would be exhausted by January, and that a further \$600,000,000 (say £120,000,000) would be necessary to bridge the gap to the end of the present fiscal year (June 30th, 1935). The Budget is unbalanced to the fantastic extent of some \$8,000,000,000 (say £1,600,000,000). Mr. Roosevelt is spending at the rate of \$40,000,000 (say £8,000,000) a day; thereby breaking the record hitherto held by Mr. Lloyd George of £7,000,000 a day. In July last a general strike was declared in San Francisco and Oakland to support a two-month-old strike of the longshoremen. The general picture is one of decreasing industry, increasing unemployment, increasing governmental expenditure, increasing strikes: the grim parody of less work, more pay that lies at the basis of N.I.R.A.

It is not as if the United States lacked the contrasting experience. The United States is indeed the traditional home of private enterprise. Mr. Henry Ford, who himself at the age of fourteen spent his day working on his father's farm and his evenings repairing clocks for no pay and with the only objective of finding out how clocks worked, is a product of the United States. When as a young man he walked to Detroit, the headquarters of his present gigantic business, he took a job as a mechanical apprentice working sixty hours a week for $2\frac{1}{2}$ dollars. In addition he worked four hours every evening in a jeweller's shop for 2 dollars a week. Before 1914, in the early days of his own private enterprise, he paid his workmen less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ dollars for a nine-hour day. Since the war he has quadrupled his rates of pay and is now paying 8 dollars a day to half a million people. But the whole point of his life has been that work comes first and that profits must be increased before wages can be increased. He pays more wages than Mr. Roosevelt's codes themselves demand, yet has been the stubbornest opponent of N.I.R.A. for the simple logical reason that you cannot pay wages first and then make your profits, nor can the workers or the Government dictate to employers the terms on which the employers are to conduct their own businesses.

The contemporary history of the United States does not differ from that of most other civilised countries. Civilisation has overstepped itself. Political organisation, which originated as a means of safeguarding the common security of life and property, has itself become the greatest menace to life and property. Politics destroyed 10,000,000 men in the Great War. Politics are robbing the propertied classes and distributing the proceeds unproductively among the electorates that keep the politicians in power; and as the process develops, more and more officials, politicians and seekers after office obtain a stake in its continuance. The disease has spread its roots deepest in Europe, where business enterprise, international commerce and even religious freedom are the pawns of political strife. The United States has entered upon the like path. Japan, being, fortunately for herself, fifty years behind the times, is the only remaining country in the world where freedom is understood and respected.

GEORGE GLASGOW.

September 15th, 1934.

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
FULL REVIEWS	497
THE EPIC OF BRITISH INDIA; THE VICTORIAN TRANS- FORMATION OF THEOLOGY; NATURAL LAW AND THE THEORY OF SOCIETY; EGYPT; SHAKESPEARE STUDIES; PEACE AND NATIONAL DEFENCE.	
SHORTER REVIEWS: ROSSINI; THE ORIGINS OF MODERN SPAIN; THE OLD INNS OF ENGLAND	509
NOTICES OF BOOKS: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN GERMAN PROTESTANTISM; THE MONASTIC REMAINS OF NORFOLK AND SUFFOLK	512

THE EPIC OF BRITISH INDIA.

"Indian history has never been made interesting to English readers, except by rhetoric." That is a faithful saying. It is taken from *The Times* of forty years ago, and is one of many epigraphs planted with unusual aptness along their line of march by the authors of a fine book, which itself is calculated to afford a disproof of the statement. Dr. Thompson, Leverhulme Research Fellow in Indian History, and Mr. G. T. Garratt, a former member of the I.C.S. in Bombay, have together accomplished an exceedingly fine service. They have worked over the amazing record of the British in India, and in 650 pages have produced a brilliant piece of narrative and interpretation—invaluable as history for the general reader, vital in style, and fascinating throughout. Here in short is the one-volume history of British India for which we have been waiting, brought down to the White Paper. One cannot doubt that its permanent place is assured.

During the century between the accession of Elizabeth and the death of Cromwell, the authors remind us at the start, a

* *Rise and Fulfilment of British Rule in India.* By Edward Thompson and G. T. Garratt. Macmillan.

fiercely competitive England hunted for markets. The markets were found and opened, at the cost of unlimited effort and danger. The East India Company's struggle with its rivals makes the most romantic story in the whole history of colonial trade, and fortunately, as Thompson and Garratt put it, the Company's correspondence, now available in lavish fullness, is of unsurpassed interest and individuality. Our authors quote continually as they move along, and they have the keenest eye for a picturesque point and a telling phrase. Five divisions of the book carry us through the era of conquest and expansion, on to the eve of the Mutiny. No imperialist adventure in any age can have attracted so many daring and masterful men, and in no other field can certain characteristics of our race have been more astonishingly displayed. Here, set forth with a ringing confidence of knowledge and understanding, are the actors on this tremendous stage—the pioneer adventurers, the reckless commanders, the administrators learning their craft by doing seemingly impossible things. One by one the men and their performances are weighed afresh; one by one they stand out in their almost incredible arrogance and audacity. There is a note of hard fairness in the authors' judgment of motive and character; and in a similar tone they discuss the attitude of the older British rulers of India towards such central institutions of Hinduism as Suttée and Untouchability. What, one wonders, would have been the general upshot in India if the method and temper of Sir Charles Napier had stood for the policy of the Houses of Parliament and the Court of Directors?

It is when they come to the events and movements of the modern period that Thompson and Garratt tread their most difficult stretch. The opening of this period is marked by the viceroyalty of Ripon and the founding of the Indian National Congress half a century ago. The whole of the latter part, dominated by the unique figure of M. K. Gandhi, is, of course, steeped in controversy. Readers familiar with the earlier constitutional stage of the Congress will probably feel that the treatment here is slight, especially as regards the remarkable group of men (too many of them, unfortunately, rhetoricians) who, in shaping the Congress, showed that they had been nurtured entirely in English political thought. For that reason, no doubt, among others, their mark upon the India of to-day is hardly visible. The authors strive to end upon

a note of hope, expressing their conviction that, despite all the miseries of the past twenty years, there is no reason why "a far healthier relationship" between Britain and India should not be established with the making of the new Constitution. When the book went to press they were anticipating that the India Bill would be in Parliament this year. If it can be carried before the next general election, all parties, save the extremists, should be relieved and gratified.

S. K. RATCLIFFE.

* * * * *

THE VICTORIAN TRANSFORMATION OF THEOLOGY.*

Frederick Denison Maurice was expelled from his Chair at King's College, London, for heresy in 1851; in 1931 the College built the sepulchre of this prophet by founding a course of lectures in his honour. The present reviewer, who had some part in the inauguration of the lectureship, cannot refrain from expressing his pleasure that Dr. Scott Lidgett should have been chosen to give the second series. No one could have been found whose thought and work are more in harmony with the spirit of Maurice. Dr. Lidgett has been well inspired in the choice of his subject. Maurice cared intensely for theology, and his social ideals had a close connexion with his belief about God and Christ. These lectures are a fine tribute to a great man. They essay to estimate his influence on theology and they are written by one who has drunk deeply of the well whose water he praises. The author sets out to show that Maurice was the most significant figure and the most creative personal influence in Victorian religious thought. This thesis is sustained by an account of the intellectual and spiritual conditions of the Victorian Age, followed by a sympathetic analysis of Maurice's leading conceptions.

Maurice had, unfortunately, no gift of style, and this defect will probably always prevent him from being as widely read as Newman; moreover, he founded no party, so that he has not the glamour conferred by partisan hero-worship; but discerning students will always give him a foremost place

* *The Victorian Transformation of Theology*; the second series of Maurice Lectures. By J. Scott Lidgett, C.H., M.A., D.D. Epworth Press.

among those who re-interpreted Christianity for the modern world. Dr. Scott Lidgett is right in laying great stress on the change which Maurice produced in the spirit of theology. He moved away from the Calvinistic conception of God as pure sovereign will and from an exclusive preoccupation with the "scheme of redemption." The doctrine of the fatherhood of God was brought into the centre of Christian teaching and established as the guiding principle of theological construction. Johannine rather than Pauline thoughts were given the pre-eminence. We knew from his earlier writings that Dr. Lidgett agreed with Maurice on this fundamental question, and it is encouraging to note that he has not been shaken by the recent recrudescence of Calvinistic conceptions of God. "If God," he writes, "be 'altogether other' in the sense of Otto and still more of Karl Barth, it would appear that He can, in no sense, come into relations with man, and that the grace, which Barth seeks to magnify, must operate by a miracle which is wholly unthinkable." These words go straight to the vulnerable point of the Barthian theology. Space does not allow us to follow Dr. Lidgett in his exposition of the Incarnation and Atonement from a Maurician standpoint. He has shown the permanent value of Maurice's contribution to modern Christian thought and will send many readers back to the works of his hero. In these days of carping books about great men it is refreshing to read a study which is inspired by a whole-hearted and discriminating admiration.

W. R. MATTHEWS.

* * * * *

NATURAL LAW AND THE THEORY OF SOCIETY.*

F. W. Maitland, who was accustomed to weigh his words, pronounced Gierke's *Das deutsche Genossenschaftsrecht* the greatest work he had ever read. In 1900 he published that well-known book *Political Theories of the Middle Ages*, and published it with an introduction not unworthy of Gierke himself. Now Professor Barker translates five sub-sections of Gierke's fourth volume, which was published in 1913. He

* *Natural Law and the Theory of Society, 1500-1800*. By O. Gierke. Translated with an Introduction by E. Barker. Cambridge University Press. 2 vols.

translates them lucidly and he also translates the notes, adding occasionally within brackets sources of later information. These two volumes do him great credit, and deserve a place on our shelves beside Maitland's book. In effect, we have Gierke's survey of natural law and the theory of society from 1500 to 1800, accompanied by a lecture on the ideas of natural law and humanity by Troeltsch, whose premature passing we still deplore.

It is plain that Gierke exercises over Professor Barker the fascination he exercised over Maitland. Gierke reached the ripe age of fourscore when he passed away in 1921, but on his passing in 1906 Maitland was only fifty-six. He ought to have had another twenty years of life before him, and we sigh in vain as we dream of all he might have done in those twenty years. A portion of his spirit has descended upon Professor Barker, who is continuing, in the two volumes before us, the task Maitland began. Behind the introduction of the editor the main ideas of the great German scholar stand out with boldness. In 1888 he published his *Das deutsche Genossenschaftsrecht*, and in this publication the ideas of Althusius are apparent. Althusius' *Politica* is the work of a mind uninspiring yet original; though published in 1603, it possessed slight influence. No doubt Grotius and Pufendorf, Thomasius and Rousseau, attest the influence, however slight, of Althusius' book. Gierke pronounced that there was need of only one man akin to Althusius in spirit to awaken to new life such a personality and such a life—even after the lapse of more than two centuries. The book of 1603 awoke to life under the magic of the pen of Gierke. Nevertheless, for the most part it was lost sight of till a generation ago, and to-day its influence not only has increased but is increasing. Its outstanding merit in our day is the theory of the corporation which Althusius expounds, and Gierke's *Genossenschaftstheorie* traces its lineal descent from the *Politica*.

Althusius opens his book with the statement that "Politics is the science of linking human beings to one another in for a social life," and the transition to the *Genossenschaft*, the co-operative association, is not hard to trace. It goes back to the proposition of Aristotle that man is a being living in communities. Political life for Althusius assumes in general the consociational nature and in particular the method of governing by estates. The membership of a higher association,

like the city, included the membership of lower associations, like the family. Social relationships form the essence of the State, while Althusius emphasises its corporate nature. The State is the community organised for co-operation towards the attainment of the higher life. At the same time Gierke holds that the corporations, composing the State, claim kin with it, and they appear "not as artificial persons, but as living members of the highest collectivity." Every association creates for itself a common life with a common will, and gives up to the higher union, the State, only so much as the higher union demands for the attainment of its ends.

For our own part we must confess we entertain a dread of the State as the all-devouring "Leviathan" of which Hobbes dreamed. We therefore read with particular pleasure this exposition of natural rights as they present themselves to Gierke's mind in the centuries from 1500 to 1800. The Reformation era was saturated with the ideas of natural law, and no one bears stronger testimony to its potency than Calvin. This natural law is also plain in Althusius, though Gierke reveals how far-reaching was its power over thinkers we little dream that it fascinated. Under many guises he perceives the attraction that the law of nature possessed. Perhaps his greatest achievement was the freeing of jurisprudence and political science from the hard and fast hypothesis that had repeatedly ruled them, and substituting for them a new method of approach. He wrote ten thousand pages—and he did not write a single page too many—and in all of them he attempts that most difficult of all tasks, to see the Many in the One and the One in the Many.

ROBERT H. MURRAY.

* * * * *

EGYPT.

Lord Lloyd's second volume on Egypt* deals with the troubled and controversial course of Anglo-Egyptian relations in the post-war period. Lord Lloyd himself played a prominent part in the story. His four-year tenure of the post of High Commissioner (1925-9) is of considerable dramatic interest,

* *Egypt since Cromer*. Vol. II. By Lord Lloyd. Macmillan.

because it was an open secret at the time that Lord Lloyd's precise views on what may perhaps be called Imperial philosophy were not uniformly shared by those who directed policy from Whitehall. When Mr. Henderson became Foreign Minister in the summer of 1929 he made certain open criticisms of Lord Lloyd in the House of Commons, which gave Lord Lloyd no alternative to resignation. From the official documents already published, one knew that Sir Austen Chamberlain also had not seen eye to eye with Lord Lloyd on all matters. It is therefore right, as well as interesting, that Lord Lloyd should tell his own story. The personal issues—whether Mr. Henderson was fair or not to Lord Lloyd and the like questions—are not nearly so interesting as the insight we are given into the difficulties that almost unavoidably arise between an active and earnest diplomatist abroad, concentrated objectively on the work in hand, and the executive politicians at home who have an eye on three objectives: (1) the work in hand; (2) the electorate; and (3) the governments of other countries.

Lord Lloyd reveals the whole story in great detail and in due order. Although the casual reader would enjoy the book more if the matter had been more compressed, it is clear that Lord Lloyd's main purpose, achieved at the expense of a certain amount of overlapping, is to leave nothing out: in short to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but. In effect he is writing a personal apologia. Yet he does not write in a defensive spirit. It is one of his attractive qualities that his sincerity, simplicity and straightforwardness enable him to write without any personal bias. Even those who do not like his views will like the man.

As for views, the conflict revealed is intensely interesting. There is no denying the chronic muddle in Egypt or the indeterminate objects pursued by the political executive at home. What is the basis of any Imperial policy? In the first instance it is the conquest of a foreign people by force for the benefit of the conqueror. The altruistic motive in the first instance is a bit hypocritical, if unconsciously so. In British Imperial mentality there is a traditional afterthought concerned largely with the interests of the conquered. There is the famous notion that the British Empire depends for its bond upon goodwill. In some cases that is true. In others—as Lord Lloyd rightly argues—the Whitehall attempt to mix

conquest with goodwill falls between the two stools. This is how Lord Lloyd puts it (page 10) :

Until 1914 we had been sure of our Imperial mission. There were domestic quarrels as to how that mission should be carried out, but no serious doubt as to its existence. After 1920, on the other hand, self-determination will be found to have shaken to its very foundations our faith in an Imperial policy of any kind. Self-determination will be found to govern our dealings with Egypt, and to obsess the minds of all concerned. After the passage of a decade it is perhaps not too soon to assess the results that this new theory has produced. It has been at work not only in Egypt, but through the whole of Europe and Asia. With the havoc it has wrought elsewhere we are not directly concerned, but there may be useful lessons to be learned from tracing its course in the Nile Valley.

What is clear is that predominant Egyptian opinion since the war has not wanted British rule. The British Government has attempted in effect to force Egyptian opinion to want British rule. By contrast, Lord Lloyd's philosophy has the merit of consistency, simplicity and honesty. Yet such are the muddles of this imperfect world that the true full logic of Lord Lloyd's philosophy would be a continued subjugation by the sword. And that, also, is folly. G. G.

* * * * *

SHAKESPEARE STUDIES.*

In the space available for a review of this composite volume, with its fourteen expert contributors and three appendices, it is, of course, possible to deal only with some of its outstanding features. But it may be said at once that the two editors are justified in claiming that it is "a book, not a mere assemblage of discourses." Through the various chapters (as they may be conveniently called) there runs a unifying purpose and outlook.

Mr. Granville-Barker is not only a co-editor, but in his chapter on "Shakespeare's Dramatic Art" he has furnished the core of the work. For this he has unique qualifications, combining the practical experience of an all-round "man of the theatre" with critical vision and a highly sensitive prose

* *A Companion to Shakespeare Studies*. Edited by H. Granville-Barker and G. B. Harrison. Cambridge: At the University Press.

style. In some forty pages he here gives us the pith of what he has set forth in more detail in his well-known "Prefaces to Shakespeare." Nowhere has the case for the boy actor of women's parts in Elizabethan plays been so convincingly put. With illustrations from *Romeo and Juliet* and *Antony and Cleopatra* it is shown how Shakespeare safeguards the position by never setting the boy to do anything ridiculous or embarrassing, or making any call upon "sex appeal." Another aspect of Shakespeare's technical dexterity is illustrated in his treatment of the conventions of place and time on the Elizabethan "cipher" stage, evidenced, for example, by a comparison between *Richard II* and Marlowe's *Edward II*. And in the concluding section of his chapter, "Fireside versus Theatre," Mr. Granville-Barker, while putting fairly the "fireside" view, shows, in my opinion, conclusively that it is in the theatre alone that dramatic art can command its full appreciation.

Thus his chapter leads back to that on "Theatres and Companies" where Professor C. J. Sisson says to much the same effect: "It is right to think of Shakespeare in terms of the stage as well as of literary categories. He worked in his medium and there was evidence enough that he was content to do so." Dr. Sisson's researches in the Public Record Office into documents bearing on the Elizabethan theatrical annals are well known, and he draws upon them in his discussion of the distinctive characteristics of the boys' and the actors' companies and of the "public" and "private" theatres.

From another point of view Mr. Granville-Barker's chapter leads forward to those on "Shakespeare the Poet," by Mr. George Rylands, and on "Shakespeare and Elizabethan English," by Miss G. D. Willcock. Mr. Rylands, with a gift for illuminating phrase, traces the stages in the development of Shakespeare's style, and dwells on his use of imagery, conceits and metaphor. Miss Willcock opens fresh ground in the contrast she draws between the mid-sixteenth period of hesitation about the future of the English language contrasted with the settled position of Italian. About 1580 began an era of growing confidence and energy. "Acquisition was in the air; there was a buccaneering spirit abroad in language as well as on the high seas." Shakespeare therefore "turned dramatist at (linguistically as well as otherwise) a singularly fortunate time. Ten years earlier or ten years later

would have made significant difference." Words sufficed as the medium of his art, and as Professor E. J. Dent emphasises in his informing chapter on "Shakespeare and Music," in spite of his musical knowledge and sensitiveness, "he never adopts the principle of opera. . . . If Shakespeare had had any conception of the Italian operatic principle, he would have made Hamlet or Othello burst into melody at moments of crisis."

Another group of chapters deals with Shakespeare's background. They are, so to speak, headed by Dr. J. W. Mackail's austere restrained presentation of the known facts of the dramatist's life disentangled from all legend and conjecture. Dr. G. B. Harrison, the co-editor of the volume, deals with "The National Background." Of this, as his three *Elizabethan Journals* have shown, he has a peculiarly intimate knowledge, and he does a service in reminding us that behind Elizabethan drama from *Tamburlaine* to *Hamlet* lay the vicissitudes of a great war and the disturbing question of the succession to the throne. One may question, however, some of the detailed applications, as in the cases of Falstaff and Laertes. Miss St. Clare Byrne is similarly well qualified to discuss "The Social Background." There are few more sparkling pages in the volume than those in which she contrasts the *bourgeois* arrangements of the Capulet household with those of a great Tudor mansion, or the informality of Macbeth's castle with the etiquette of the Elizabethan court. The "background" group is completed by the chapter on "Shakespeare and the Drama of his Time" from the accomplished pen of Mr. Bonamy Dobrée.

Of the more technical chapters on The Sources and the Text, Shakespearian Criticism and Scholarship, and Shakespeare in the Theatre, contributed by such authorities as Mr. Attwater, Dr. A. W. Pollard, Mr. T. S. Eliot, Mr. J. Isaacs and Mr. Harold Child, and of the useful reading lists and tables, I can only make mention. If the lists are occasionally (as I think) tipped rather overmuch on the side of books of to-day, as compared with those of yesterday or yesteryear, this must be left to the verdict of to-morrow. In this Cambridge Press volume every Shakespearian will find in the fullest sense of the current phrase a "good companion" to his studies.

FREDERICK S. BOAS.

PEACE AND NATIONAL DEFENCE.

The recent aerial manœuvres over London demonstrated once again the ineffectiveness of defence against air attack and reminded us that in a future war the issue will be decided within a few days, if not hours, of zero time. Sir Norman Angell, in his recent book,* has examined the problem of national defence with especial regard to these dominating factors. He fully recognises the need for waging war for the purpose of defence, but his main argument really resolves itself into the maintenance of peace, for as he says in one passage, "it is broadly true to say that if you solve the problem of defence, you solve the problem of peace." He is here brilliantly expounding a fresh approach to the collective system which is alone the guarantor of peace. His thesis is directed to the collective sanction of force behind the rule of international law. The effort for peace has become too often associated in the minds of many with the advocates of a sentimental pacificism which can add nothing to the attainment of international justice. "To the normal man . . . the Pacifist or the League advocate seems to disregard the needs of defence, to be asking us to take risks with our defence on behalf of some extraneous moral ideal." Sir Norman does well to restore a balanced outlook, for, as he points out, the case for the collective method as a system of defence and therefore of peace must depend upon its effectiveness.

Sir Norman begins his argument by endorsing the now accepted view that the only defence against the overwhelming destruction of an air attack is the threat of retaliation. When will such a threat be effective? Only when the contingency of retaliation is specific and exclusive.

In order to make a threat of punishment effective it does not suffice, either in the case of men or nations, to say: "Do this and I will punish you." It is also necessary to say: "Refrain from doing this and I will not punish you." For if he has grounds for thinking he will incur the punishment in any case, your threat loses all effectiveness.

The Great War was an illustration. Germany offered to respect Belgian neutrality if England remained neutral. No undertaking was given, and "the Germans therefore

* *The Menace to Our National Defence.* By Sir Norman Angell. Hamish Hamilton.

argued : 'We shall have British power opposed to us whether we respect Belgian neutrality or not. In terms of military realism therefore it does not matter whether we go through Belgium or not.'” Had Germany known before 1914 that her course of conduct would have brought the world against her, she would have avoided the struggle. It follows that “the technique of using power as a deterrent . . . lies at the very heart of the problem of defence.”

The effectiveness of a threat of retaliation as a deterrent will depend upon its use in a collective system and upon the purpose of its exercise. Between rival nations or alliances of states, it can provide no guarantee against war. Sir Norman discusses a policy of isolation and concludes that it is only compatible with peace if we surrender national armaments, which is realistically impossible. The sufficiency of armed defence must always be tested by its relation to the strength of the potential aggressor. Since a deterrent is useless unless it be superior in force, there begins inevitably a race in armaments and alliances which ends, as in 1914, with an attack as a method of defence against the rivals' increasing power. The restraint imposed by a preponderating group of states is more effective but at most it cannot make for permanent peace, because it has made itself judge in its own cause. “Both parties were putting might not behind right, but behind each party's view of its own rights.” The purpose of collective power, like a national police force, is to prevent a party to the dispute from deciding the issue by arms.

If an alliance says : “We intend to pool our power for the purpose of securing third party settlement of disputes ; join us and we grant you all the privileges we claim ”—then the states so addressed *have* an alternative to competition for power.

Sir Norman is not worried about the location, composition or command of an international police force. The existing national forces become police forces “from the moment that they are the instruments of an international policy which embodies a workable rule of international life.”

Discussing the question of national grouping, Sir Norman envisages a Germanic-Japanese alliance with the possibility of a war against Russia, in which both Japan and Germany can satisfy their dreams of expansion. Against this alliance will be formed in one common defensive purpose a preponderating group of nations. Nevertheless, following his main

argument, the power of such a combination will be no deterrent unless it forgoes the idea of unilateral judgment and pre-commits itself to the common purpose of ensuring that the issue be determined by an impartial tribunal. As the whole gist of Sir Norman's case is that the deterrent, to be effective, must guarantee equality of right, the court itself must be established and regarded as impartial by the party to be deterred. Would Germany or Japan have such trust in the World Court or other tribunal in the circumstances supposed? This is a point which Sir Norman does not answer, although it is vital to his argument. The answer is that confidence in the interpretation of international law, as in the other instruments of a collective system, will be proportionate to the impartiality exhibited in former cases. It must be upon the slow growth of precedent that the collective method will be ultimately raised.

The need for a co-operative system, whether it be within the League or in external grouping, has been accentuated by the overwhelming danger of air attack. Sir Norman concludes his book by pleading to the British Government to work for its abolition. Both France and Germany are sympathetic. "The majority of powers," he emphasises in block letters, "have declared in favour of abolishing national air forces and internationalising air transport."

SHORTER REVIEWS.

Rossini.* The story of Rossini provides a very interesting view of the development of Italian opera. His output in youth and early manhood was prodigious, his first opera, *Demetrio e Polibio*, having been composed in 1806 at the age of 14. He would receive an order to produce an opera, which he turned out in three weeks or so after receiving the *libretto*. Time and again these performances were failures, partly on account of popular prejudice against innovations, partly because they were considered too German. With all his lightness of touch, his cadenzas written for a particular singer, the poverty of the wording and frequently the absurdity of the plots, Rossini's underlying ideal was Mozart, and his style was of a higher order than the Italian opera of his day. His more elaborate orchestration and the introduction of new and more numerous instruments gradually won recognition, but he had a hard struggle. *Tancredi* was his first great success. The public was

* *Rossini: A Study in Tragi-Comedy*, by Francis Toye. Heinemann.

charmed by the "new vitality of the music and above all by the originality and charm of the tunes." Mr. Francis Toye, in this full and fascinating account, discusses opera after opera and enlists the sympathy of the reader with his subject, a very mixed character. Those of us who only know *The Barber of Seville*, the *Stabat Mater*, *William Tell* and perhaps the *Boutique Fantasque*, will want to hear others which had a furore in Venice and Rome and Naples and which made his fame. The account of Rossini's life in Paris at a later stage and of his long period of musical inactivity after the age of 35 is full of interesting stories of his relations with other great musicians. The famous Saturday evenings, when singers and players came to Rossini's house to make music, were thronged by all the world, and invitations were much sought after. There was a London visit in the winter of 1823-4, where Rossini became the favourite of Society and even sang duets with King George IV.

George had a flabby bass voice (rather like his person) and Rossini, whose natural quality was that of a light high baritone, used to sing tenor and, of course, to play the piano. It is said that on one occasion His Majesty interrupted the performance, saying that he had made a mistake in the time; to which Rossini replied with courtly irony: "Sire, you have every right to do exactly as you please; I will follow you to the grave." The spectacle of these two fat gentlemen—for Rossini by this time had already begun to put on flesh—singing *buffo* duets from *Cenerentola*, and such-like operas, must have been highly diverting. It provided material for the caricaturists of the time.

Perhaps one of the most surprising friendships was that of Wagner, who visited Rossini once in Paris and had a long discussion with him on theories of opera. In spite of so great difference, Wagner found more pleasure in Rossini's music than is usually supposed. After the visit he is reported to have said that of all the musicians he had met in Paris "he alone is truly great." The greatness is brought out and the qualifications of it are very carefully and sympathetically handled in this excellent book.

* * * * *

Professor J. B. Trend's recent work, *The Origins of Modern Spain*,* is a valuable contribution to the study of the movement for the intellectual emancipation of Spain. It is mainly an appreciation of the band of liberal thinkers who worked to remove the obstacles to knowledge and culture imposed by Catholic dogma and clerical control of education. The volume begins with the state of moral and intellectual stagnation under "that impossible lady," Isabella II. After the failure of the republic of 1873, which was monarchist at heart, the restoration of the Bourbons witnessed a violent clerical reaction. But the struggle continued, and Professor Trend describes the aims and work of the reformers. He begins appropriately with Sanz del Río, who instituted "a renaissance of philosophic studies and of scientific activity . . . and opened the eyes of Spain to the intellectual life of Europe." He

* Cambridge University Press.

inspired Francisco Giner and his colleagues in their tangible work of progress. They were convinced that "the only hope for the regeneration of Spain lay in the spread of education in the broadest sense." Inspired by the example of England and Germany, Giner saw that the object of true education was to encourage the development of personality. In glaring contradiction to the Jesuit methods, the pupil was to be given "facts, data, individual and concrete forms upon which he can afterwards build his own conclusions." From the foundation in 1876 of the Free Educational Institute as a protest against clerical and state control, the work has steadily progressed. Through their diffusion of culture and learning, the influence of Giner and his followers, such as Salmerón, Costa, Azcárate and Cossío, with whom the author specifically deals, laid the foundations of a new moral and intellectual consciousness among the Spanish people. To them will be largely due the success of the second republic which, says Professor Trend, is proving "generally a great deal better than the old monarchy."

* * * * *

Dr. A. E. Richardson's new book *The Old Inns of England** is an attractive survey of this great English heritage. Some 132 superb photographs and a number of excellent drawings by Mr. Brian Cook are an outstanding feature of the volume. The history of the English inn reaches back to the early Middle Ages. Dr. Richardson points out that the earliest remains which now survive are a few fragments of the 14th-century tavern, as in the traceried windows of "The Coopers' Arms" at Hitchin. "The George" at Glastonbury is a fine example of a 15th-century pilgrims' inn. With the dissolution of the monasteries and national expansion, the 16th century was a heyday for the inns, and, with the advent of coaching in the 17th century, their prosperity and usefulness steadily increased until the rise of the railways. Contemporary architecture is faithfully reflected in the English inn, and Dr. Richardson cites many typical buildings of each period and gives us a glimpse of their internal arrangements and traditional hospitality. He wisely treats separately the smaller inns and alehouses which have retained their local atmosphere and tradition in contrast to the cosmopolitan tendency in the larger urban establishments. Contemporary life and events frequently determined the tavern sign. Dr. Richardson gives long and interesting lists of names and, incidentally, doubts the popular theory that "The Goat and Compasses" is derived from "God Encompaseth Us"; "the compasses are more likely to be masonic." But for the most part he avoids the continual controversy upon this question of nomenclature. A history of inns could be compiled from contemporary literature, and Dr. Richardson cites a number of well-known quotations from *inter alia* Chaucer, Shakespeare, Dr. Johnson and Dickens. This survey and appreciation of the traditional English inn is especially welcome in these days of its renewed activity.

* B. T. Batsford Ltd.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Dr. Otto Piper's *Recent Developments in German Protestantism** is a most instructive little book. Dismissed from his Professorship after the Nazi revolution, he was invited to lecture in Manchester University on the latest phases of Protestant thought in his own country. The volume, however, gives more than its title suggests, for it begins with a very careful analysis of Luther's theology. The gigantic figure of Luther, indeed, dominates the whole work, and the author's admiration for his depth and range is unbounded. The main portion of the lectures is concerned with post-war theology, which falls into the conservative and the progressive schools. Both of them emphasise the factor of doctrine, unlike the liberal schools of the pre-war decades. But they differ in many ways, and within the Progressive School itself there are wide variations. Even Karl Barth himself, its outstanding figure, has changed his position and may change it again, for he is still in the full tide of his intellectual growth. The reader will also find a useful summary of the teaching of Gogarten, Emil Brunner, Tillich, and other leaders of the younger generation. There are a few references to the crisis in the Church caused by the tyranny of the totalitarian state and the emergence of the "German Christians" as its champion. But Dr. Piper writes with restraint of the distressing features of the present situation, which must sorely grieve him both as a Christian and as a patriot. The book is packed with thought, and it contains a mass of information not easily accessible elsewhere.

* * * * *

Historians and antiquarians, especially in East Anglia, will be grateful to Mr. Claude J. W. Messent, A.R.I.B.A., for his new book, *The Monastic Remains of Norfolk and Suffolk*.† He has compiled in alphabetical order a list of nearly three hundred abbeys, priories, hospitals, leper houses and other monastic establishments in both counties. Mr. Messent has included in a bare historical sketch of each institution an account of its foundation, type, and monastic order, the value of its property at the Dissolution, where possible, and the subsequent owners, and describes the extent of any existing architectural remains. The author has largely relied upon Richard Taylor's *Index Monasticus*, published in 1821. The text is supported by a large number of excellent drawings and plans. The greater monasteries have their own literature, and Mr. Messent's catalogue of the smaller institutions and their remains gives to his volume its real value. The buildings of many have entirely disappeared and others are forgotten and fast decaying. This book is both an invaluable record of what remains and an incentive to the better appreciation and preservation of our architectural heritage.

* Student Christian Movement Press.

† H. W. Hunt, 14 Orford Hill, Norwich. Limited edition.